

**THE CHRISTIAN
REVOLUTION
BY HENRY T. HODGKIN**



BR 115 .S6 H62 1923
Hodgkin, Henry Theodore,
1877-1933.
The Christian revolution



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/christianrevolut00hodg>

CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION SERIES

No. 17

THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

LAY RELIGION

THE WAY OF THE GOOD
PHYSICIAN

FRIENDS BEYOND SEAS

THE MISSIONARY SPIRIT AND
THE PRESENT OPPOR-
TUNITY

(SWARTHMORE LECTURE)

STUDIES IN THE EPISTLE TO
THE HEBREWS

THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION

An Essay on the Method of Social Progress

BY

HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B. Cantab.

AUTHOR OF LAY RELIGION, ETC., ETC.



LONDON: THE SWARTHMORE PRESS LTD.
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40, MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
NEW YORK: GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

First Published in 1923

All Rights Reserved

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY HEADLEY BROTHERS,
INVICTA PRESS, ASHFORD, KENT.

TO
JOY
and HERBERT and JOHN and PATRICK
and MARTHA,

the members with me of my home,
my colleagues in trying to make one little spot
where love is supreme
and

where the Christian Revolution can begin :
and to all men and women bound with us in this same
enterprise—especially to
my comrades and friends in the

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
and the
MOVEMENT TOWARD A CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONAL

in company with whom I have found my way to many of the
places explored in these pages,

I affectionately dedicate this book

in the confident hope that through such associations the day is
drawing nearer when

The Lord shall judge between the nations,
And will decide concerning many peoples ;
And they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
And their spears into pruning-hooks ;
Nation shall not lift up sword against nation,
Neither shall they learn war any more.

PREFACE

FOR two or three years I have been hoping to find time to write a book which might be a worthy contribution to the solution of the problem of social and international reconstruction. In the summer of 1919 I spent part of my holiday in writing a manuscript which I hoped to use as a basis for this volume. I sent it in as a competing essay for the Walker Prize in connection with the University of St. Andrews. When I learned in Chungking, in March, 1921, that this essay had been selected for the first place in that competition, I was not only greatly surprised but somewhat puzzled. I could not any longer use these chapters as the basis of the larger work I had contemplated. I had, therefore, to begin my work all over again.

For eighteen months I have been engaged in very strenuous work, lecturing to students, Chinese and Japanese leaders and foreign communities mainly on social and international questions. It seemed almost hopeless to prepare the volume of my dreams. Feeling, however, that it would not do to wait indefinitely, I have made the best use I could of two short holidays in Kuliang and Shanghai, and so have completed the manuscript. No one can be more conscious than I am myself of its inadequacy and imperfections. It contains the substance of lectures given repeatedly and worked over in keen discussion with students and others in this and several other lands. To these I have added such material as I could, and the whole has been re-written so that those who have heard the lectures given will not find in these pages simply a rehash of what they have heard. In many cases the lectures had to be given under conditions that made some sections inappropriate, and I have, of course, cut out in what is here written nearly all the special references to Chinese conditions. For those who read Chinese I may add that the Hunan Educational Association

(Changsha) has published two of my courses in a single volume, and that a third course has appeared in the paper *The Life* (Shen Ming), published in Peking. In these courses special reference is made to Chinese conditions, and the treatment moves towards the statement of the special Christian contribution, instead of springing out of and seeking to explain it.

The attempt to deal with such far-reaching questions, under such circumstances, away from a library, and without the possibility of discussion with my colleagues in production of the Christian Revolution Series, may be judged a failure. I hope not, for I am very anxious that this series may be carried forward in a way not wholly unworthy of the excellent work done by other writers in it. I believe that what I have here said does, to some extent, sum up or explain the main purpose that was in our minds when the series was first outlined in a retreat at Jordans early in 1918. But this volume, standing upon the others, is incomplete without them. I have made references to other volumes in the footnotes, but I could easily have added many more, and the reader who is interested in what I have here written should make himself familiar with the rest of the series. I believe they set forth a view of life, a theory of social progress and a doctrine of God for which the present age is not only ready but eagerly waiting. No doubt much else is being written that covers parts of the same ground, but I know of nothing else which has done it so thoroughly, and from exactly this point of view. Those of us who have written, well realise that we have but touched on the outskirts of the subject, and that a great territory remains to be claimed, but we trust that where we have trodden it may prove that we have trodden truly, and that we shall not have to retrace our steps.

The books as a whole, are submitted to the judgment of the public, to those within the Churches to whom we appeal on the basis of our common faith, to those without to whom we present an aspect of Christianity

that may have a somewhat different appeal from much that has been familiar. To both sections we hope that the appeal may ring true. Too long have we been content to divide Christianity like mathematics into "Pure" and "Applied," and to assume that pure Christianity cannot be applied and that applied Christianity can never be pure. It is our aim to break down this false distinction. But it is not writing or preaching—it is plain Christian living—which must be the great force in accomplishing the result. To all who read these volumes we would say then, "If ye know these things happy are ye if ye do them." What men need to-day is the incarnate word.

My own previous volume in this series was originally planned to contain much of the matter presented in this one, and the two are really one. What I have here said needs the background of *Lay Religion*. I hope those who plan to read this volume may, if they have not already done so, scan the other first.

What is really needed is a new movement of life in the world, a rising up of the young and the open-minded to do and to dare. The world seems to be drifting on towards another war, towards social revolution, towards race cleavage, and, while there are many who hold up hands in horror, there are few indeed to lead away courageously from these evils into something bigger and better. A Washington Conference is called, and all eyes turn wistfully towards it, yearning for some signs of real insight and bold statesmanship; and then when we see how timid a step towards disarmament it really takes, we sink back disappointed and say "What more could one expect!" It is in some new direction we must look. Too long have we pinned our hopes on princes and presidents, on leagues and conferences. There is a place to which we can look without danger of disappointment. It is to the central fact in the world's strange history of effort and failure, hope and disappointment—the Cross of Christ. Let that amazing fact be reinterpreted and

freshly presented to the thought and life of to-day, and there will be a possibility of advance such as we have almost despaired of!

In preparing this volume I have to thank the many audiences who have listened to me in England, Europe and the Far East, and by their attention and their questions have stimulated my thought and compelled me to face many issues. I have especially to thank Mr. and Mrs. Edward Smith, of Inghok, Fukien, and Dr. and Mrs. MacGillivray, of Shanghai, whose hospitality has been extended to me while I have been writing these pages and who have thus enabled me to get the leisure needed for the work. I have also to thank my friends Dr. Frank Rawlinson, of Shanghai, Rev. C. A. Neff, of Foochow, and Mr. A. Neave Brayshaw, of Scarborough, for kindly reading the manuscript and offering helpful criticism and suggestions, and Misses Thompson, French and Angel for help in the typing. As in all my labours my wife has been partner and critic; she has also prepared the Index.

Many others have been drawn upon in ways too numerous to mention. In certain sections, especially, I feel that I have been able to say very little that has not been better said by others. What I hope is that, in bringing together thoughts, many of which are not new, and putting them in a certain setting, I may have helped to give them a new emphasis.

When all is said and done this way of love is amazingly simple, and all the arguments seem almost foolish to the child who understands. Would that I had the real eloquence that convinces by the direct method!

In many heads the love of God
My sermon urged, yet missed the place:
The daisy gave her one a nod,
And proved the case.

HENRY T. HODGKIN.

GINLING COLLEGE,
NANKING.
Easter Sunday, 1922.

CONTENTS

PART I—PRINCIPLES

CHAPTER	PAGE
I A WORLD IN TORMENT - - - -	21
i. The failure of Western civilisation—we do not profit by it—Love as the guiding star.	
ii. Diagnosis of social unrest—ill-distribution of wealth—exploitation—ultra-nationalism—spirit of militarism—materialism.	
iii. The disclosure of the failure not enough—the Church has disappointed us—the war not as destroying the good but as exposing the evil in civilisation—illustration from “Economic Consequences of Peace.”	
iv. The deeper evil—a denial of love on the part of all—not taking Christ seriously—class-thinking—hard-heartedness as a virtue—abstract thinking—unchecked self-expression—individualistic idea of goodness—lack of imagination—spirit of domination—the call of to-day for daring men and women.	
II THE CREATIVE DREAM - - - -	47
i. The need for dreaming—its dangers—the dreaming of Jesus was creative—due to His deep sense of God—Love as the outstanding attribute of the Father—need of this thought if we are to understand the dream of Jesus.	
ii. This dream consists first in—conscious relation of all life to God—the uncertain elements in the Universe—progress an essential element—importance of direction of movement.	
iii. The Kingdom of God—the King is a Father—to be set up in men’s hearts—as they are “born again”—to be set up in this world—to be realised soon—contingent on human effort.	

CHAPTER

PAGE

- iv. Why has the dream not been realised?—its “impossibility”—difference of language—example of Olive Schreiner—a dream for all to dream—the Divine Light in all—the dream has been creative.

III THE WAY - - - - -

69

- i. The phrase “The Way” in the New Testament—the way to a new social order—Christ saw relation of means to end—the Sermon on the Mount not an ideal but a method—Jesus believed it to be practicable—does the end justify the means?—the deepest fact for Jesus was the Love of God—Mencius on the way of love.
- ii. Evolution *v.* revolution—Professor Urwick and social evolution—where this leads us—evolution made possible by the presence of revolutionary spirits—Telemachus—the early Christians—the Quakers—the disaster of compromise—we have to “believe a great deal less or a great deal more.”
- iii. The way in which revolutionary living effects social changes—
1. Association—need of this for understanding of complex problems—searching for God’s will in common—experience of Friends—need of patience—unity in the group—variety of method—Church—guild—reliance on the spirit.
- iv. 2. Infection—definition—the missionary spirit—domination—superiority—proselytising—comparison with the war spirit—good if of the right type—more infective than evil.
- v. 3. Experiment—the incarnate word—making the world believe by example rather than by coercion—simile from making a motor-road—failure of the other ways—power of adventurous living—prudence as the deadly sin.
- vi. The above method shown in the work of Jesus—it liberates the omnipotence of God which is the omnipotence of Love.

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV FALSE STARTS - - - - -	101

- i. The exaggerated importance of the State—value of other groupings.
- ii. The Political Method—its dangers—compromise—expediency—power concentrated in the hands of the few—working from above downwards—cannot appeal to emotion of ideal—legislation for men as they are and not as they may become.
- iii. Violent Revolution—natural revulsion—value in removing great ills, breaking through illusions, etc.—dangers in breaking continuity, excess, reactions, etc.—Bolshevism—its claim to be inevitable—is the appeal to goodwill hopeless?
- iv. Coercion—a digression on its value and dangers—eight principles to guide in application of force—abstract principles not enough—an incident—the Christian duty to redeem the offender—Jesus and the money-changers—is “keeping the ring” a Christian duty?—the Babylonian captivity—Jesus and violence in defence—the duty of a non-Christian community—the Christian’s position in such.
- v. Granted the dangers, is there any other way of progress? a brief summary of the dangers—the way of the Christian Revolution the only creative way—the way of love.

V CHANGING THE SYSTEM - - - - -	123
---------------------------------	-----

- i. Can the method of the Christian revolution alter the system?—The distinctive Christian contribution—sometimes through failure.
- ii. The creation of public opinion—direct appeal to responsible agents—stimulation by example—clarifying the issue—reducing the number of those who will work the system—assumption of special responsibilities.
- iii. The Christian and politics—a Christian political method—the spirit of the servant—relation to a non-Christian community—German reparations.
- iv. The real task—its greatness and variety—lands in the ocean—a people’s movement for the new order.

PART II—APPLICATION

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI THE HOME - - - - -	139
The value of the illustrations in Part II.	
i. The dream of Jesus a world-family—the importance of the home—personal testimony.	
ii. The home as a sphere for the operation of love—true love is not indulgence—obedience and the rights of the child—the relationship of loving trust—punishment—the child's attitude to life—the Creator of a new world—love is revolutionary.	
iii. The home as a community with one purpose—service to society—birth-control—a universal atmosphere—purpose in the humblest tasks.	
iv. The home where all is related to God—religious exercises—a natural development—the parent to share his deepest convictions with his child.	
v. The kind of home needed—life-long monogamy—religious basis—Bertrand Russell criticised—sex-equality fundamental.	
vi. The home as a place where experiments are made—social ostracism—danger to children—economic risks—the many nameless homes where this is being practised—their supreme value.	
VII THE SCHOOL - - - - -	163
i. Modern educational ideas—the thought of Jesus about children—dangers of an education that deprives children of essential qualities—innocence and directness—loyalty—truthfulness—creativity and imagination—expectancy—Christ's enthusiasm for children—the teacher's need.	
ii. Aims of Education—individual development—passing on the heritage of the past—fitting the child for life in a community—giving him true standards of judgment—the religious aim, to train in love—a true understanding of these needed—some illustrations.	

CHAPTER

PAGE

- iii. Dangers to education to-day from different influences—commercial efficiency—militarism—the state idea—are we to train the child to fit into the present system or to create a better one? The power of a school that trains for the Christian revolution—the child to learn his true relation to God and to his fellows.

VIII THE CHURCH - - - - - 187

- i. The Church as the environment in which the individual can work out his contribution to creating a new social order—The local congregation as a centre of social activity.
- ii. The purpose of the Church—carrying forward the work which Christ began—revelation of God—reconciliation—revolution.
- iii. The Fellowship of the Church. Danger of making purity an aim—the aim of the Church as the determining factor in her membership—the effect of a sense of purpose on the Church's life—an example—every member contributes to the one end, creating a new world—the value of variety—the laboratory of love.
- iv. The Worship of the Church.—Relation of all to God and His purpose—sympathy found in united worship—place of silence—sacrament of Lord's Supper—unity of all.
- v. The Work of the Church—not always through ecclesiastical channels—experiments towards a Christian revolution—communism in early Church—other communistic experiments—guiding principles—Brethren of the Common Table—reconciliation in a strike.
- vi. A United Church—the weakness of disunity—one voice on social evils—one way of dealing with them—one testimony against war—a missionary Church—need of a research department—in various countries—its method—how to begin it—an illustration—can the Church we know become such a body?

IX THE WORLD OF INDUSTRY - - - 217

- i. The power and cruelty of the economic system—its majesty and value—need and danger of interfering with it—are we bound by it?—legislation not enough.

CHAPTER

PAGE

- ii. Principles of social well-being—how can we discover their application?—need of a complete change (*a*) in relation to property (*b*) in the wage system (*c*) in principle of production—*noblesse oblige* instead of *laissez-faire*.
- iii. The world not ready for drastic changes—need of a new spirit—experiments—the A. Nash Company, its strength and weakness—the Rowntree Cocoa Works—can we stop at such efforts?—the true nature of the economic system, example from Shanghai.
- iv. Experiments looking to a relinquishment of power by the property-owning class—the Shareholders' Movement—the National Movement towards a Christian Order of Industry and Commerce—Experiments towards the reorganisation of industry—the industrial Council in the Building Industry—Building Guilds—Guild Socialism—its attitude towards coercion—importance of working for this end by pacific methods—Christianity and socialism.
- v. The value of such experiments—a testing-ground for theories—awakening the best in men—giving fresh hope—one leads on to another—a fellowship of adventure—a deeper purpose—love in action—the discovery of God.

X THE WORLD OF NATIONS - - - 247

- i. A discouraging prospect—League of Nations, value and drawbacks.
- ii. Need of something more—a conviction that all war is wrong—a possibility of the future—basis of this conviction—the early Church and the Church of to-day—statement by Dr. Cadoux.
- iii. Experiments towards a peaceable policy for a State—Pennsylvania—trying out the way in war-time—real meaning of the Conscientious Objector—statement by Sparkes—is this way creative?—positive goodwill—Friends' Emergency Committee—the value of such work—groups formed—witness given—bridges built—after-war results—who was doing most to end war?—The Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Movement Towards a Christian International—entertaining Austrian children—rebuilding at Esnes.


CHAPTER	PAGE
iv. The unseen movements towards internationalism—appealing to the best in men—examples in national history—the Treaty of Ghent.	
v. The Christian way for nations—difficulties in responsibilities to others, etc.—a disarmed nation—a policy consistent with this—relation to uncivilised peoples—and to civilised nations.—duty of discovering the way of love internationally.	
vi. The love of peace, is it enough?—our need of one another—God in the midst.	

XI THE HEART OF THE MATTER - - 279

- i. The need of a great religious movement—is the way of Christian revolution really revolutionary?—is it impossible?—between despair and over-confidence.
- ii. The marks of a religious movement—facing the material conditions—recognising the spiritual—fearless for truth—marked by sympathy—moral earnestness—adventure—a new discovery of God.
- iii. Why the religious note?—the central position of Christ—Christianity a life—the life of love—new men and women—progressive application of Christ's principles—the promise of the dawn.
- iv. Some closing questions.

APPENDICES

A. SCHEME FOR A F.O.R. SCHOOL. Note to Chapter VII - - - -	293
B. BRETHERN OF THE COMMON TABLE. Note to Chapter VIII - - - -	297
C. FINDINGS OF FORUM ON SOCIAL QUESTIONS AT WORLD'S CHRISTIAN FEDERATION CONFERENCE, PEKING, APRIL, 1922. Note on Chapter IX - - - -	301
D. THE SERVANTS OF THE CHURCH. Note on Chapter IX - - - -	305



PART I
PRINCIPLES

CHAPTER I
A WORLD IN TORMENT

“What bewilders the alien observer . . . is not the occasional aberrations of the Christian nations but their habitual conduct and organisation ; not their failures, but their standards of success ; not their omission to live up to right principles but their insistence that wrong principles are right. Your religion is a noble if paradoxical creed, which affirms that all men are brothers, that humility and poverty are blessings, and riches a dangerous misfortune, that the way of service and self-sacrifice is the way of happiness. I do not blame you for not reproducing those theories in your practice. Evidently they are not meant for daily life. What surprises me, however, is that you erect into a system the duty and happiness of practising precisely the opposite. The normal condition of your social order is an economic civil war which you hardly take the trouble to conceal. Your industrial system involves the regimentation of masses of mankind by a few thousand rich men who are, individually, no doubt, innocuous, but who quite frankly regard their subjects as somewhat rebellious and inconvenient instruments of production. . . . Your creed is exalted, but your civilisation is a nightmare of envy, hate and uncharitableness. I would forego the former in order to escape the latter.”

*An Indian quoted at the Glasgow Student Conference.
January, 1921.*

CHAPTER I

A WORLD IN TORMENT

I

So much is being written about the present condition of the world, and so many remedies are being proposed for the sickness of humanity that I greatly hesitate as I seek to put down my convictions in respect to these matters—convictions which have been born in me during the disastrous days of war, and in the still more disastrous days of a false peace. Yet as I scan the ever-growing literature by the would-be physicians of humanity, I fail to catch sight of just that mountain peak that my eyes sometimes see through the mists. That which I have seen, albeit dimly, I dare not keep to myself. Because you who read and I who write, are we not travellers together seeking to explore a great unknown country? Do we not need all the help we may be able to bring to one another? Can we, dare we do other than share the knowledge of every token that comes to us of the goal, and of the way by which we may together climb on until we reach it? Between us and the distant summit lie many deep ravines: the path will pass through almost impenetrable jungles: fog will envelop us time and again: the heat of the day will exhaust us, and we shall be compelled to sit awhile and rest by the way. But what matter, if we know that we are on the right path, if once and again we catch sight of the mountain-top, if it may be given us to have good fellowship as we journey together?

But here is the tragedy of human society. We are so unsure about the path, seldom if ever do we clearly see the end, and all along the way we quarrel like so many fretful children too tired to know what they want

In the midst of our best strivings ever and again the inconvenient question will come back, "Are we really getting anywhere?" The pathos of some of the best efforts men make lies in our uncertainty as to their value. Has even the matchless devotion and heroism of men and women in all the nations which lately were at war with one another achieved any result that compares with the sacrifice or with the spirit in which it was made? Do the patient efforts to remodel our industrial system, or the daring experiments of our boldest reformers bring nearer the day of equal opportunity for all? When revolution has done its best or its worst and cleared the decks of the lumber accumulated through centuries, can we take advantage of our newly-won freedom, are we bringing the ship into action?

It is not failure—even the failure of a whole civilisation—that is the most disquieting fact in the world situation. The real trouble is that we are not profiting by our failure, that we have not learned how to use it as a stepping-stone to nobler things. For failure may be the very best thing that can happen either to a man or to society. How much better for the man whose life is based on greed and cruelty that he should fail, and perhaps begin again at a new point, than that he should prosper! How much better for us all that our civilisation, based as it has been to a large extent on greed and cruelty, should be shown up for the failure that it is, than that we should go on blindly building on such unsafe foundations!

To anyone who looks beneath the surface, the failure of modern (western) civilisation is the most obvious contemporary fact. It seems unnecessary to spend time in labouring the point. The subject of our enquiry must rather be the causes of the catastrophe, and, in the light of these causes, the means by which we may build more surely in the generations that follow. We begin with the assumption that there is a possibility of so building, that the Universe is so made that we are not

doomed for ever to watch the rise and fall of one civilisation after another, each cataclysm more terrible than the last, until humanity itself is engulfed in the results of its own folly and error. Even in the midst of apparently hopeless circumstances then, we set out upon a hopeful quest. We follow no will-o'-the-wisp, but the "Master light of all our seeing." The storms assail our frail craft, but for the patient watcher in the night there is a star that can be trusted and that yet gleams in the heavens—seen again and again as the storm-clouds drift past.

Truly one star above all souls shall brighten
 Leading for ever where the Lord is laid :
 One revelation thro' all years enlighten
 Steps of bewilderment and eyes afraid.

Us with no other gospel thou ensnarest
 Friend from beneath or angel from above !
 Knowing one thing the sacredest and fairest,—
 Knowing there is not anything but Love.

Guided by this star how are we to interpret the events of our own time? What do we find to be the deeper causes of our failure? Whither shall we direct our vessel, and what course are we to steer?*

* Compare the following from a leading article in *The Nation* (London) Dec. 11th, 1920, p. 672. "The world that existed before the war is lost. It has lost a great deal of its money, which was everything to it, as well as its honour, which was nothing to it. But a star still rises above the wreck. No society has ever existed without a religion, and even this sophisticated world has not been left without what our fathers used to call 'the means of salvation.' The faith of Jesus remains, though His Churches have long buried the treasure of hope and effort that it contained. Once spoken, the immortal word that summoned society, not, indeed, to lose itself in the entanglements of a Creed, but to find its Soul, can never pass away, for it continually reveals itself afresh in Art and in Reason, that is to say, in the consciouness and the imagination of man, so that while he lives the pursuit of Truth and the service of Love shall never go out of fashion. The Churches may go preaching and teaching on, with few to mark them, but there is only one question for them—will they, can they, re-dedicate themselves to the ministry of such a religion?" For my position as to the place of the Churches in the work of reconstruction see *Lay Religion*, pp. 16-19 and footnote, and also Chap. VIII of this volume.

II

It is an axiom of medical practice that diagnosis precedes treatment, that it is folly to prescribe for symptoms until we have discovered, or done our utmost to discover, causes. It is with a strictly practical purpose, then, that we enter upon an analysis of the world situation. The object of this volume is to expound a certain view of social progress, the method of the Christian Revolution. That is to say my aim is strictly constructive. I am not to be tempted on the one hand into mere diatribes against existing evil or the discussion of how to overthrow particular abuses. Nor, on the other hand, can I allow myself the satisfaction of spinning theories of social betterment that cannot, within the compass of a small volume, be related to the problems we are facing to-day. My object is to set forth without wasting words, what I venture to call the practical politics of the Kingdom of God. Yet to do this at all adequately one must spend a short time on looking at the background, the material in which we have actually to work. The builder is concerned not only with drawing up plans, but also with examining the substratum on which his house has to be built and the materials at hand for the building of it. In this sense I turn to the examination of our present world-order.

Looking somewhat superficially at Western civilisation, I am inclined to put our larger social ills into five main categories. The task of weighing the relative importance of each I shall not attempt, the order being simply one of convenience.

First, then, we may take what to many is the chief source of all our woes, *the ill-distribution of wealth*. Mr. R. H. Tawney has recently shown in his own inimitable way, how the ideas of ownership which were originally developed in a society in which men owned their own tools, the things they needed for personal use and for their service to society, have been carried over

into a society in which many of the tools have passed out of the hands of the workers into those of capitalists. He has developed the thought that an "acquisitive society" must be replaced by a "functional" one in which every income carries with it a responsibility to make a certain definite contribution of social service. To this fundamental thought we must come back. Here all we need to do is to point out that these inequalities in possession are a standing cause of social unrest, and that the sting lies in the fact that many possessors regard their possessions as relieving them from any social obligation. As long as the possession of things is regarded as a chief good it is impossible to eliminate this cause of disquiet. There is, I hold, enough wealth in the world to provide a sufficiency for all (without at the moment discussing how far it may be adequate to deal with the needs of an increasing world-population, or what may be the precise content of the word "sufficiency"). But the fact remains that very large sections of the world's inhabitants have not enough, economically, to provide for the quite obvious needs of body, mind and spirit. Inequality of possessions means, in our present social system, inequality of opportunity. Unrestricted competition is seen to have brought about its own nemesis, and already the arch-competitors are beginning to combine in ever larger ways. If co-operation is to replace competition, however, this is clearly not the end at which to begin, for such a method only spells a still greater disparity between the "haves" and the "have nots." Such co-operation is prompted by the desire for personal or class profit, an entirely different thing from co-operation springing out of a new social idealism.

The second category is *exploitation*, under which term I include all activities in which some men are used by others solely or mainly as a means to their own enjoyment, enrichment or power. In so far as the worker is merely a hand, in so far as the weaker races are forced to labour for the well-being of the stronger,

in so far as woman is used to gratify the passions of man, the whole of society suffers. There can be no ultimate security for righteousness where any section of the community is exploited in the interests of any other section. The gravamen of the charge brought by "labour" against "capital" in these days is not so much the unequal distribution of wealth as the far deeper fact that the labourer is used for what the employer can get out of him, that he is simply a means towards the end of private profit. That many business enterprises are conducted on far finer principles does not do away with the fact that, underlying modern large-scale production, is the tacit assumption that the worker's part is to accept a living wage and the capitalist part is to handle the surplus profit. This is as much as to say that the owner of capital, after paying a decent wage and getting the largest possible price from the public for his goods, is justified in doing exactly as he will with the gains of the transaction. Such a moral assumption is based on the supposed right to exploit both the worker and the consumer, and is only conceivable in a system of thought dominated by those who stand to gain by its application. It would be far nearer the truth to say that after capital had received a small and strictly limited dividend, the profits of industry should be allocated among the workers, although this would be no final solution, as it leaves out the consumer and the community as a whole to whom the fact that there is any surplus is largely due.

It is not, however, only or perhaps indeed mainly the exploited who suffer. The exploiters are certain to degenerate and the whole standard of justice suffers. For justice is based upon an ideal of intrinsic human worth which is fundamentally denied wherever exploitation is practised. What is wrong with great wealth, then, is that it puts into the hands of some men not necessarily peculiarly qualified for the task (and who is qualified for it at all?) power to dominate and control the lives of others. He who possesses a

million pounds possesses also the lives of hundreds or thousands of men, women and children, and becomes for them an embodied destiny. For them it means bondage even if the autocracy be a kindly one or be restrained by a more or less kindly State. For him it means moral degeneration, unless he is saved by a miracle. "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God," said Jesus. "Then who can be saved?" asked His followers amazed, for surely these were the people with the largest opportunities, everything was weighted in their favour. But for the Master there was only one hope, "All things are possible with God."*

The late Professor Rauschenbusch, in his little volume *Dare we be Christians?* has stated this point in such notable words that I take leave to quote them in enforcing this point. "Whoever utilises a woman to satisfy his desires, without respecting her soul and her equal human worth, prostitutes her. Whoever utilises a man to satisfy his desire for wealth, without respecting his soul and his equal human worth, and without realising the beating heart and hopes of his fellow, prostitutes him. Whoever gives the consent of his mind to getting unearned gains, to getting more from his fellows than he returns to them in service, steps outside of the realm of love. If the law protects semi-predatory undertakings it involves all the citizens of a democracy in wrong-doing. If the Church looks on injustice without holy anger it allows the institution of redemptive love to give shelter to lovelessness, and is itself involved in the charge of hypocrisy."†

We may take as the third outstanding cause of unrest in the world the evil of *ultra-nationalism*. I had almost used the word without the qualifying prefix, so largely has the cult of nationalism been to blame for embittering the relations of men with one another. Whether we look at the age-long feud between Germany and France, or at the policy of a new state like Poland

* Mark x. 23-27.

† *Op. cit.* pp. 45, 46.

we see the same thing—a national spirit feeding on hatred and jealousy towards other nations, swollen with pride until it becomes a standing menace not only to the peace of the world, but to the well-being of the citizens of the affected state itself. Looking at the matter historically it seems almost impossible for any community, organised as a State, to become acutely self-conscious without becoming infected by a kind of virus which makes it a danger to one or more similarly organised communities. I am not one of those who deny any value to national culture or to national ideals. My hope for humanity lies not in an undifferentiated cosmopolitanism, but in a converted nationalism where each community functions as a servant of the world commonwealth bringing in all its treasures to the common stock. Nevertheless nationalism, as it is expressing itself in our modern life, is, on balance, an evil comparable to those which have already been named. It serves to keep the world in torment. It organises the anti-social instincts of men into a system of intrigue and misrepresentation and prejudice, so that multitudes of kindly folk, who wish to love their neighbours and live at peace with all men, can be whipped up in a few days into a frenzy of brutal and passionate feelings which express themselves in murder on the gigantic scale. Such people seem to me rather the dupes of an evil set of ideas than the makers of a terrible tragedy. Their enthusiasm for righteousness, their hopes for a better world are poured into the moulds prepared for them by unimaginative statesmen, and they themselves are staggered when they awaken to the grim fact that this molten material has hardened into the moral equivalent of tanks and “ Big Berthas ” and containers for poison gas, and this not through deliberate ill-will, but through the hypnotic influence, the heady fumes, if you will, of nationalistic clap-trap.

While I cannot go all the way with Tagore in his fierce denunciation of Western Nationalism, I can subscribe to much that he says, and I think we owe him

a debt of gratitude for the searching words in which, speaking as a true friend of England's best self, he says, among other things :—

“ The truth is that the spirit of conflict is at the origin and in the centre of Western nationalism ; its basis is not social co-operation. It has evolved a perfect organisation of power but not spiritual idealism. It is like a pack of predatory creatures that must have its victims. . . . This bartering of your higher aspirations of life for profit and power has been your own free choice, and I leave you there, at the wreck of your own soul, contemplating your protuberant prosperity. But will you never be called to answer for organising the instincts of self-aggrandisement of whole peoples into perfection, and calling it good ? . . . The West has been systematically petrifying her moral nature in order to lay a solid foundation for her gigantic abstractions of efficiency. She has all along been starving the life of the personal man into that of the professional.”*

Under this heading it is my thought to include race-hatred and antipathies sometimes expressed in national antagonisms, sometimes in more personal ways. No problem at present on the horizon seems more baffling than this, and no cause of discord in the human family seems more difficult to deal with in any radical way. Yet it has long been a question in my own mind as to how far these supposed antipathies are instinctive and hereditary, and how far they are the result of deliberate or even unrecognised educational influences. Certain it is that if we are to realise the dream of human brotherhood we must find some permanent solution for this problem—and I start out upon this quest also with good hope as to the result, because my thinking on social problems leads me to an ever deepening conviction that men and women of all kinds can live together in harmony on this earth—if they will.

* *Nationalism*. Rabindranath Tagore, pp. 21, 28 and 33.

The fourth main cause of world disaster is the *spirit of militarism*. By this I do not mean simply the exaggerated manifestation of the disease which we labelled Prussianism for purposes of war propaganda. I should rather define it as the idea that physical force is the most potent thing in the world, and that, at any rate in the last resort, we must turn to it in order to maintain law and order in the world, or even to bring about any radical change for the better; in fact that our civilisation rests ultimately upon coercion. It is this idea erected into a system, that is crushing more than half the world to-day, that "necessitates" armies and navies, that makes all talk of disarmament seem like idle tales.* The war, which seemed like the victory of the less militaristic peoples, has turned out to be an unprecedented victory for the militaristic spirit. Never in history has the world been so given over to this idea. I write these words in China, where huge armies are being drilled and supported by rival chiefs, where disbanded soldiers are organised in almost every prefecture into brigand bands, and where the whole country is faced with the danger of financial exhaustion, largely because so large a proportion of the potential producers are being turned to this useless and nefarious trade. But China is only, in this respect, a picture of human society the world over. South America seems to be the only considerable section of the globe that is not, to a large extent, crushed by militarism. Men have come to think that these huge preparations for war are a necessity as a kind of insurance against war. Such is the degenerate state of our thinking that even the years from 1914 to 1918 have not served to discredit the maxim, "If you want peace, prepare for war." And so we prepare, rushing down the steep place like so many devil-possessed swine into a certain Nemesis,

* Since this was written the "Disarmament Conference" at Washington may seem to have contradicted these words. To my mind, however, the conference has confirmed them. It has only dared to discuss limitation—a totally different thing from disarmament.

piling up armaments and squandering the wealth we so greatly need for houses and education and the development of world resources, in vain and foolish expenditure. The preparation of these marvellous machines is indeed the strongest possible temptation to use them, and every person or firm that is added to those financially interested in war and the preparation for war, is one added factor in prolonging the torment of humanity.

If we choose to carry on our international, and our national life too, on the assumption that the strongest factor in human life is brute force, one thing is certain, we shall more and more surely degenerate into brutes. The Great War marked not so much the break-down of diplomacy as the break-down of moral and spiritual idealism. Its deeper tragedy was that no other way seemed possible by which to meet the evil spirit that was in the world—no other way than to invoke the same evil spirit in using the same evil means. Those who should have been foremost in discovering and announcing a real way for overcoming evil with good were the first to mount the pulpit and the recruiting platform in the interests of a method as ineffective as it is wrong. The torment of the world to-day is just here, that men are beginning to see that they have chosen the wrong way of overcoming evil, but that there are so few to point them back to the right way. We hardly like to admit even to ourselves that we have made so ghastly a mistake which has cost the lives of so many millions. Yet it is only as we admit the mistake (made in all honesty and with sincere devotion to the best by how many) that we can hope to see clearly how to avoid making it again. So far there seems small recognition indeed that we lost sight of the true way of social progress in the summer of 1914. We are too much afraid of seeming to throw over the men who died. Yet if we are to realise that for which they meant to give themselves, we have to forsake the way they took. Force—physical force—is not the strongest factor in society.

There is a better way, and one which we can use even "in the last resort." It is our purpose here to try to find it in company.

An easy transition carries us to our last category for which we take the much used and abused word, *materialism*. By this term I do not mean philosophic materialism, and I am not here raising the issue of the nature or existence of God. I am thinking, rather, of the attitude towards life which assumes that material things are the real things, that organises society on the basis of that which can be handled and measured and valued. This may be said to be the unquestioned axiom of almost the whole of Western civilisation, so far as it expresses itself in social and political organisation. I am not overlooking the fact that there are multitudes of persons who, in their private lives, have an entirely different philosophy and who really do express it in many ways. Nor am I forgetful of the various learned, religious and artistic societies that bring together men and women on the plane of the higher interests and pursuits. Of these things I shall have more to say later. But here I am concerned to urge that our organised common life, and in particular our industrial and political associations, are founded on the idea of material values. Whatever heights men may reach in spiritual aspiration and achievement we have not yet learnt the art of conducting the ordinary affairs of life as if we really believed that man's highest good were something that transcended, and in a certain sense were independent of, the material conditions of his earthly existence. No one who follows me through this volume will read into this any attitude of unconcern as to the conditions of life that make it so terribly hard for many to realise their higher natures. But after all it is still true that "man does not live by bread alone," and a society that fails to organise its common life in the full recognition of this fact has in it the seeds of innumerable discords and distresses. Efficiency becomes a god, and by efficiency we come to mean that

which will enable a man to succeed in gaining material ends. The machine dominates our life and we find ourselves caught up in it, working feverishly for a good that we cannot attain, and which in our heart of hearts we do not regard as supremely worthy of attainment. In the interests of this "material good" one after another of the "immaterial" values are discarded. And yet it is just these immaterial things that give ultimate satisfaction, and these are the things that can be provided for all, that increase as they are shared and that never need become the objects of dispute and discord. A society based on a true perception of values can be harmonious and progressive. A civilisation in which the main idea of success is material prosperity, where policies are determined by markets and the possibilities of exploiting men and resources, where education is mainly controlled by the thought of fitting the child to get rich, and where humility and tender-heartedness are regarded as weaknesses—such a civilisation is sure, sooner or later, to disclose its own instability, and for the sake of all concerned the sooner the disclosure is made the better.

III

Now it is simply the disclosure of our failure that troubles many people. A few years ago all seemed to be going so well! We were discovering all kinds of new laws in nature and turning her vast resources to our daily use with astonishing rapidity. People were coming together in ever closer relations, bound to one another, so it seemed, by economic necessity if not by mutual regard. Wealth never dreamed of by earlier generations was accumulating in the hands of the few, while standards of living were less quickly but not less certainly, being raised higher for the many. New and more efficient methods for reaching to power, wealth and comfort were being proclaimed from the house-tops. We were rioting in prosperity and drunk with

our own success. If we thought of the future at all it was to sink into an easy and unthinking optimism, to assume that progress comes "of itself," and so to excuse a lazy acceptance of the good things of life.

How rude has been the awakening! Nature's secrets have been discovered only that we may be the more terrible in our hatred, more powerful to destroy whole populations in a war that has no respect for persons, and that is waged on all sides scarcely less against women and children than against fighting men. Our vast wealth has been poured out like water to sweep our enemies to a surer destruction. Our powers of organisation have been harnessed to the most cruel engine the mind of man has ever conceived. Standards of living have been allowed to fall in every country in order that the death rate in the world might be increased. The utmost skill and ingenuity have been directed towards ends that have filled the world with sorrow, and left bitterness and resentment which it may take generations to wipe out.

And in the midst of this tornado of destruction we have looked in vain to the forces of religion, as organised and officially voiced, to call us to our senses. The very evils we have been looking at in this brief survey have often been buttressed, and seldom seriously combated, by official Christianity or by any other religion. Individual Christian voices have been raised, but the Church (as outwardly organised) has been seen as the bulwark of a society that regarded the rights of property as sacred, even when they manifestly infringed the rights of personality. She has been seen to bless a nationalism that was the expression of corporate pride and prejudice. She has driven even the reluctant ones into the ranks of those whose God was force, when it had been her high privilege, had she known "the day of her visitation," to proclaim a higher way by which evil, even on the large scale, might not simply be restrained but overcome. Ringing down the ages we seem to hear again the voice of One who says, "let them alone ;

they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind both shall fall into the pit. . . . If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness ! ”*

What the War has done is not, then, to destroy something inherently good, or to threaten it with destruction. It has rather been the culminating point in the processes of disintegration which were already at work. It is no isolated phenomenon, a bad dream from which we must awake to take up again the real business of life. Many people are so treating it. The so-called realists in the political world regard it as simply the latest of a long series of conflicts, dating back from an undiscoverable past and forward into an invisible future. They, at least, have the merit of holding a consistent view of life, and one that avoids the cant of a creed that we do not intend to translate into our corporate life. But we can only follow this philosophy at infinite peril. What another war may be the mind fails to imagine, and we turn with horror from the attempt to picture it, and spend an evening instead in watching the movies! † But our social salvation may in large part depend upon our looking steadfastly at this evil thing, and forcing ourselves to keep the picture long enough before our eyes to let it burn itself into our souls. The European war served to throw upon the screen for all to see the real tragedy of our boasted civilisation, although it had been there for those who cared to see it all along. While it lasted we had no need to go to the city slums or to the prisons and asylums and poor-houses to get a glimpse of the inner failure of our social organisation. Now it is over,

* Matt. xv. 14, and vi. 23 ; No doubt the Church has been caught “ napping ” by the rapid, scientific, industrial and international developments. Part of the failure is that which is shared by all leaders who have not been quick to apply principles to new conditions. But if the principles had been more clearly grasped their application to the growing life of humanity would have been easier and more thorough.

† See *The Next War*, by Will Irwin. Dutton & Co, New York.

instead of setting ourselves to master its meaning and to illuminate its lessons by comparison with the many other symptoms of the same disease, we resign ourselves to the "inevitable," and go to work to make it ten times more so. So calmly, deliberately, but oh! how blindly, we organise for the greater catastrophe of, let us say, 1950.

Let me illustrate this from one of the most discriminating and brilliant analyses of our present distresses, Mr. Keynes' volume on the Economic Consequences of the Peace. Here we have a masterly interpretation of the folly of our best statesmanship and an exposure of its impossible ideas in the terms of pounds, shillings and pence. Yet all through the book I look in vain for any recognition of the fundamental cause of so bad a peace. Individuals are praised or blamed (mostly the latter), and much sound sense is given us about the present and the future. But where is the acknowledgment of the simple fact that, when once you have let loose the passions of war and fed nations for years on prejudice and lies, it is psychologically impossible to create the moral atmosphere that is essential if a peace of reconciliation is to be made? The crime of Versailles does not lie at the door of the cynical, the vacillating or the dogmatic statesmen closeted in their unreal world; it lies at the door of just such persons as ourselves, men and women who allowed passions that were essentially unholy to possess us, who believed any crime of an enemy and saw nothing but good in a friend, who allowed ourselves to become the dupes of an unscrupulous press, who voted, unthinking, with the crowd. When we shut out the obvious truth that Satan can never cast out Satan, when we responded to the parrot-cry of "a war to end war," forsooth, when we dreamed the fond dream that men might gather figs of thistles, we were creating the certainty that the "peace" would disappoint the idealism of youth, and we were preparing ourselves for the great disillusionment. No one ever nailed down more surely the coffin of hope.

IV

Not yet, however, have we completed the diagnosis. We must make some effort to think behind the five causes of our group failure, and to see the inner meaning of that which has cost us so dear. We come back to our thesis that it is not so much deliberate ill-will that has brought us to this pass, as an acquiescence in evil, a failure to discern "the things that belong to our peace." Of course there is positive ill-will in the world. That we must allow for and meet in some effective way. But the difficulty is not that the forces of ill-will have been too strong for us. The difficulty is that the forces of good-will have been too weak and ill-directed. "The war," said Mr. Wells in 1914, "is the tragedy of the weak though righteous Christian will." It is not that we have got to use again the same method, "only more so." That will only deepen the tragedy. Our problem is to discover a new weapon, or perhaps how to use an old one; and if we are to do this it is of utmost importance that we do not run away with the easy assumption that profiteers and exploiters and militarists and materialists are the source of all our ills. We have to see first the profiteer, the exploiter, the militarist and the materialist in just—ourselves. And then we have to see how to cast these devils from our own souls and so how to cast the devils out of the soul of humanity. This is where the Christian Revolution must begin, and so here and now we must look below the surface and ask ourselves some searching questions.

Reduced to its simplest terms the torment of the world is due to a neglect of love. For our personal life we may be ready to accept the poet's definition of the supreme human aim :

For life, with all it yields of joy and woe,
And hope and fear—believe the aged friend,—
Is just our chance o' the prize of learning love,
How love might be, hath been indeed, and is.*

* Browning, *A Death in the Desert*.

But what attempt has been made to see this as the aim for our common life, and so to shape our political institutions as to win this prize? Is our personal political activity directed towards this end? It is easy enough to criticise a Bernhardt when he writes:—

“Christian morality is based, indeed, on the law of love. ‘Love God above all things, and thy neighbour as thyself.’ This law can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties. The love which a man showed to another country as such would imply a want of love for his own countrymen. Such a system of politics must inevitably lead men astray. Christian morality is personal and social, and in its nature cannot be political.”

We can blame on this philosophy the policies that made Germany a menace to European peace if we will. But it was not a Prussian militarist, it was a British Prime Minister who said the other day that it was impossible to run a State on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. On this statement a friend of mine, who styles himself “a hardened old agnostic,” comments “one would have thought that after two thousand years of Christianity such a statement from such a quarter would have raised a storm that would have made it impossible for the speaker ever to represent this nation again, but not a voice was raised. How different would the indignation of the Church have been had the Premier threatened to deduct one-half per cent. from their stipends! Whilst differing from the standpoint of the ordinary Christian, I feel that what Lloyd George ought to have said would be that a State can *only* be run on the lines of the Sermon on the Mount.”

But here again let us beware! It is no individual statesman who is to blame for these sentiments. Here is a man who at least has the courage to state the truth to which we constantly close our eyes. No State is run on these principles, or indeed can be, *unless* the pre-suppositions on which it rests are revolutionised.

And these pre-suppositions we share. An entirely new spirit must animate our political institutions reforming some and sweeping away others. But it is in my mind and yours that the new spirit must first establish its reign. There is no other place where it can begin to work but just here.

These then are some of the failures in love of which ordinary men and women are constantly guilty—the failures that have created the evils we deplore.

Class-thinking.—We give a man a label and put him into a certain pigeon-hole in our mind. So we endue him with all the vices (or virtues) that in our estimation pertain to this particular class. A man is a capitalist or a profiteer, and we see him taking advantage of the poor at every turn. He is a trade unionist, and others see him as a selfish shirker, only caring to get the largest possible wage at the smallest possible expenditure of labour. He is German, and the Englishman or Frenchman pictures a machine turned out to work or fight with demon-like precision, singing a Hymn of Hate and mutilating defensive children. So we go through life too lazy to individualise men and women, content to classify them and leave them at that. Such a method is the negation of love; it is the hand-maiden of exploitation and militarism.

Hard-heartedness as a virtue.—To how many of us has it become a habit of mind to think that there are certain persons or classes of persons towards whom we *ought* to act in a hard-hearted way, closing the channels of pity towards them. The criminal who has deserved prison or flogging, the profiteer for whom no penalty is too severe, the spy who is beneath contempt (if he is in the employ of another State!), the enemy whom it is our “Christian duty” to kill and whose children we make orphans with a sense of having accomplished a sacred task. It is easy to see that the Inquisitors made a terrible mistake when they thought to purify the Church and spread the faith through torture and the infliction of excruciating pain. But the way of thinking

that led to such a tragic blunder is still blessed by the Church and condoned, if not encouraged, by religious men the world over. We are not here discussing the practicability of the way of love—that must come later—we are simply stating the fact that we commonly shrink from the consequences of loving, and persuade ourselves that to some people and in some circumstances the apostolic injunction “Owe no man anything save to love one another”* is quite impossible and out of date.

Abstract thinking.—We live in an age when it is woefully easy to lose ourselves in abstractions. Big ideas, world-wide movements of thought are “in the air.” We talk very glibly about such ideas as brotherhood, freedom, sex-equality, honour, righteousness and even love. These high-sounding phrases very easily lose their content. “Perhaps he loves causes better than men”† is the pregnant phrase in which the author of *By an Unknown Disciple* sums up the attitude of mind that led Judas to betray his Lord. When we allow these fine ideas so to dominate our thinking that we lose sight of the simple duty of man to man, we are creating the atmosphere in which wars flourish. Of course, I don't deny the value of a great idea, and the splendour, let us say, of being willing to die for freedom. But where we fail is that we do not stop to consider that this commonly means that we are chiefly concerned to kill for freedom, the dying being a disaster from the point of view of winning the freedom (as we suppose) and the killing being the main purpose of our training and efforts. Yet freedom cannot be won by any method that lowers the value of men and women (as war inevitably does) for it rests upon and has no meaning apart from the absolute worth of the person, i.e., of every person.

Unchecked self-expression.—I write this heading well aware that some who will be in agreement with much I have to say may take exception at this point.

* Romans xiii. 8. cf. *The Practice of Christianity*, chap. IV, “The Regulative Virtue.”

† *Op. cit.*, p. 59.

The idea of self-expression has been emphasised rightly as a corrective of the older restrictive and legalistic discipline. When we come to speak of education we shall have much to say in support of this aspect of truth. But here I am concerned to point out the way in which this good thing has degenerated through lack of the corrective of a vigorous social conscience. Liberty has passed into licence, and the failure clearly to discriminate between the two in private life has led to a similar failure in our industrial and international relationships. To demand the last farthing, however, legally justified, is often a failure in love. To express oneself, regardless of the opinions, feelings, and even it may be, prejudices of others, is to make a true fellowship impossible. Self-expression is a virtue only when exercised in consideration for the social unit in which the individual moves. So, on the large scale, self-expression and self-determination, good in themselves, become a curse rather than a blessing. If unity is to be achieved internationally we must abolish for ever the false doctrine of the Sovereign State. To do this we must begin with ourselves and abolish the false doctrine of the self-sufficing ego.

An individualistic idea of goodness.—The word piety has come to be associated with the picture of a man whose goodness lacks robustness, is self-centred and without social content. A man who can attend church all his life, give to collections and charities, live as a father and friend above reproach, but who can carry on a business that drives his competitor mercilessly to the wall, or controls a factory that pays sweated wages, ought to be an impossibility—but it is not so. This self-regarding idea of goodness makes it possible for a man to discriminate between what he is justified in doing in two different capacities. For example, as a master towards the servants in his own home he may be full of kindness and consideration, as employer of labour on a large scale he may insist on the most exacting and impossible conditions. Or again, in relation to his

intimate friends he may be the soul of honour, while in order to get the better of a competitor, he may be guilty of a thoroughly mean act. The difficulty of seeing our way through the social implications of our faith may in part account for such failures. But we have no right to shelter behind this difficulty. If we are to be Christians at all we must relate our faith to our whole social environment.

Lack of imagination.—This is another aspect of the failure of love. It is in reality very often sheer indolence. We do not take the trouble to put ourselves in the position of others with whom we come into relation. How many men could stand behind a machine-gun if they took pains to think of the agony they were inflicting as if it were their own, or of the widows and orphans they were creating as if they were immediate relations? In race relationships we see just the same failure. How many words are uttered with “sublime” oblivion to the effect they produce on hearers of another race, an oblivion that would soon disappear if we could listen with their ears! The failure to think our way into the point of view of another person is not to be blamed on to a temperamental lack of imagination; it is sheer inexcusable laziness. But such laziness breeds war or many another ill.

The spirit of domination.—Here I am not speaking of the arrogant and harsh despotism of bad men over weaker ones. I am rather thinking of that far more subtle evil that turns man’s very good into ill. There seems to be a tendency for us when we have seen something that is good for ourselves, to wish to compel others into the acceptance of it. Perhaps to choose the good has been a real sacrifice to us, and there is something of “sour grapes” in our attitude towards those who, with an easy conscience, can still enjoy what we have turned away from. Or it may be the very laudable desire to make the world better, the genuine belief that others would be happier if they could do as we do. So instead of taking the long road of patience and

persuasion, we try to control or even coerce their lives, and to dominate them "for their own good." But how we hate to be so dominated ourselves! Does it really make us any better? Does it not stir in us the reaction toward the very evil that others would force us to avoid?

I could easily add to this list of the many ways in which the perfect law of love is infringed, often with the best intentions, by ourselves; for we who make up the ordinary world whose policies have failed so disastrously, we are the raw material of the "social order," and it is ourselves we put in the dock every time we indict society. We might easily look at our own cynicism, the unreality of much of our religious profession, the judging spirit that picks out the faults and the heresies of others, the pettiness of many of our thoughts and interests, the patronising air with which we "bestow our goods to feed the poor." But I am not seeking to make an exhaustive treatise on morals. I revert to the main proposition of this chapter, of which I have here given a few outstanding illustrations.

The world is in torment. Why? Because we, all of us, have not followed the one rule that is adequate as a rule for all our common life, because, whatever our personal faith and action, we have not seriously attempted to enthrone love in all the complex relationships of modern society. We have even called that "good" which is contrary to or obstructs the free course of love. We have got away from the simple relations of men with one another into a world of abstractions and unreality. And we live on in this world not even allowing the awful happenings of these recent years to startle us out of our complacency. We need a revolution—nothing short of a revolution will do—to awaken us to the facts and bring us into the path of love. The call of to-day is not for better statesmanship to guide this old world back into the ruts, to "reconstruct" it upon foundations essentially untrustworthy. The call of to-day is not for the bomb-thrower and the assassin to hurl out of office

and life the old reactionaries who block the path to progress. The call of to-day is not for social theorists who will spin a theory of progress, and fold their hands while the world goes to the devil. The call of to-day is for those whose lives have been revolutionised by the power of a love that dares everything, who are trying it out through scorn, opposition and failure, and will continue to try it out because they do not doubt for one moment what the final issue will be.

What such men and women are to strive for and how they may strive for it in company with one another is the theme to which we must now turn. I have done, for the time being, with the hateful topic of disease. The question of what is true social health will next absorb our attention, and then we shall be able to give ourselves to our main constructive task, the means by which social health may be achieved. Our survey has been a depressing one. Have I blacked in the shadows too deeply? Have I failed to allow for the finer motives and better aspects of our present social order? It may seem so. But no good can come of palliating evils, or pretending that all we need is a little more oil to make the present machinery work better. The present position is grave—far graver than any words of mine can paint it. But nothing that I see in it makes me or can make me call it hopeless. The world, to quote William James, has something wild in it. Just below the surface—or perhaps just above our heads—there is an element of glorious uncertainty. There is something incalculable, full of the mysterious beauty of the dawn, charged with the power of the stars, within our reach, relevant to these perplexing problems, available for their solution. We have tried to look sanely at the facts of our modern society. We shall not close without noting this fact, the never-changing ground of hope. It is the fact of God engaged in His astonishing age-long experiment of trying to make out of such persons as ourselves a world fit to live in—fit for Him to live in.

CHAPTER II
THE CREATIVE DREAM

“ He hath put down the mighty from their seat, and hath exalted the humble and meek.” A society which is fortunate enough to possess so revolutionary a basis, a society whose Founder was executed as the enemy of law and order, need not seek to soften the materialism of principalities and powers with mild doses of piety administered in an apologetic whisper. It will teach as one having authority, and will have sufficient confidence in its faith to believe that it requires neither artificial protection nor judicious understatement in order that such truth as there is in it may prevail. It will appeal to mankind, not because its standards are identical with those of the world, but because they are profoundly different. It will win its converts, not because membership involves no change in their manner of life, but because it involves a change so complete as to be ineffaceable. . . . Like Missionary Churches in Africa to-day, it will have as its aim, not merely to convert the individual, but to make a new kind, a Christian kind, of civilisation. Such a religion is likely to be highly inconvenient to all parties who desire to dwell at ease in Zion.

R. H. TAWNEY.

CHAPTER II

THE CREATIVE DREAM

I

EVERY creator is a dreamer. Not every dreamer is a creator. For a few minutes let us give ourselves to dreaming, not that we may live in an unreal universe of our own imaginings, but that out of our dreams we may discover how to make them real. In the early days of the London County Council an enthusiast for civic righteousness was sketching in a council meeting his picture of the London he longed to see. The cynic, who always seems to be waiting round the corner when we dare to disclose our deepest feelings, taunted him with being a mere dreamer. Whereat he went home, so I am told, and wrote four lines that have found their way into many corners of the world. They were these :—

“ Dreamer of Dreams ! ” We take the taunt with gladness,
Knowing that God, beyond the years you see,
Hath wrought the dreams that count with you for madness,
Into the substance of the life to be.

These are days in which we seem too busy or too *blasé* to let ourselves dream. On the one hand we are so busy getting rich, elbowing other people out of our way in the crowd that presses forward to see “ the latest,” or even in the urgent task of making the world better by the most up-to-date, labour-saving machinery, that dreaming is either a waste of time or a mere irrelevance. On the other hand we have been so successful in plotting out our curves, and scheduling all (or almost all) the incalculable elements in our scientific universe that a dream seems like reversion to primitive animism, a thing quite unworthy of the

modern man! Nevertheless the fact remains that even the truly creative scientist (as distinguished from the mere drudge of research), and yet more the creative artist or philosopher, is always a dreamer. Social reform that does not find its source in inspired dreaming will be mere tinkering with a rotten system. The revolutionist who has not had his own dream of a fairer world is simply an iconoclast; he gets no further. The Christian who does not take time to dream is a mere imitator, living on other men's dreams like a parasite, if indeed he can be said to live at all.

Of course there are dangers in dreaming as there are in everything that is worth doing in this world of ours. But we need not stop to talk about them, or we shall follow the example of many another who has simply stopped there. I am not here discussing the meaning of religion, or what our attitude should be towards Jesus Christ. These things have been dealt with in my previous volume, *Lay Religion*, to which I must refer the reader. Here I simply begin with the assumption that we see in Jesus Christ, not only the revelation of God in the terms of human life, but also the greatest leader of humanity who has ever appeared in history. His teachings are not simply "religious" in the old, narrow sense of that term. They are teachings for our everyday life and they are extraordinarily relevant for meeting the problems of to-day. As I there stated, "I have come to see in Him the most revolutionary and daring spirit the world has ever seen."* His method of making the world better was unique and original and is still very largely untried. To a discussion of it we shall return. But if we are to understand it we must take pains to understand His ideal for human society. So we cannot do better than dream with Him. I seem to remember a Greek Idyll which commences with the conversation of two fishermen, one of whom says to the other, "We have hitherto shared our fishing, henceforth let us share our dreams." Perhaps there is nothing

* *Op. cit.*, p. 24.

more fruitful in this world than the sharing of dreams, and if we can share the dreams of such a Dreamer we may be sure we shall the better be fitted to translate them into deeds.

The dream of Jesus for human society springs directly out of, and cannot be understood apart from, His acute consciousness of God as our Father. This is for Him the most important fact not only for our personal lives but also for our social and political thinking. This is why His dream is the most creative one that has ever been dreamed by sage or statesman. To try to understand it apart from this is to cut the plant from the root, which simply means that sooner or later it is sure to wither. To some people, I know this seems like putting a metaphysical difficulty in our path at the very beginning of our discussion of practical social problems.* To many I hope it may be possible to proceed, without a sense of having begun with an impossible postulate. Of course, we are mainly concerned to discuss what the dream of Jesus was, but our aim will not be fulfilled unless we are able, in some degree, to dream it with Him.

Shall we try, then, to begin where He began? Let us rid ourselves, if we can, of all those cramping, legalistic, credal, abstruse thoughts of God that baffle the intelligence and cage the soul. Our attempts at saying in adequate words what never can be said let us boldly abandon, while we dream. We shall admit at once that the words which spring to our lips are dream-words, not to be pressed to their utmost meaning until all the joy has been squeezed out of them, failing always to convey to others at all completely the content of the dream, exaggerated to the ear of one and grossly inadequate to the ear of another. Can we allow ourselves for a moment to be *infected* with the thought

* I do not wish to evade this difficulty, but we have not space here to deal with it. For those who are genuinely unable to proceed with me until it has been dealt with more fully, I would suggest a study of one or two other volumes in this series, especially *The Open Light*, and *The Way to Personality*, and my own book.

of Jesus about God, and hold over the logical and theological side of the matter till a more convenient season ?

In this spirit then let us remember how Jesus rejoiced in the Father, how for Him every common act, every bird and flower had a meaning of wonder and delight, because He saw God just there. Not a blade of grass could be overlooked, not a sparrow was insignificant. There was nothing harsh and autocratic about God: His abandonment of love opened the treasure house of the universe to just and to unjust alike; there was a prodigality in His gentleness, and in His welcoming embrace, that outmatched the prodigality of the wayward son in his debauch. Even from the the harsh and unlovely elder brother nothing that he treasured was withheld. He was ever engaged on completing, down to the last and least unit, the tale of His loved ones, never satisfied in His great hungry heart until the lost was found. The leper, spurned and loathsome, the prostitute in her shame, the child too little to be noticed by important people like the disciples, all alike claimed the sympathy and succour of Jesus. Therein He revealed His thought of God. We do not see God by isolating Jesus and looking at Him and His teaching as a separate phenomenon. We see God by seeing Jesus in His relation to men and women. It is always at the point of contact between persons that the light of God breaks into the world of men. As the point of contact between the two black carbons becomes, when the current passes, the point of brilliant illumination, so when the current of love passes from person to person a glowing centre is created in the heart of which God is. And it is easy to see why this must be so for God is love, and love is a personal relationship. The thought of God that we need in human affairs is not an abstraction to be played with in the schools; it is a dynamic fact that creates joy and goodness and holy enthusiasm. So God is pleased to shine into our life through a Person, who lived among men and whose

every contact with them let light and energy into our darkness and despair.

I am not arguing that there is no terrible side to nature, or that God is, as it were, afraid of hurting our feelings. His love may be expressed at times in ways that can only be compared to the father snatching his child roughly from the peril of fire or the crowded street. * But what Jesus was most anxious to do was to prevent men from thinking too meanly of the Father's love. For Him the thought of God was not a fetter, but the most wonderfully liberating thing imaginable. He must be in the Father's house even as a boy ; and as a young man, facing what we should call premature death, it was to the Father's house, where there was room for all, that He thought of returning.† There could be no sort of question as to the liberty of that home, its welcome, and even its preparation for all.‡

There's a wideness in God's mercy,
Like the wideness of the sea ;
There's a kindness in His justice
Which is more than liberty.

For the love of God is broader
Then the measure of man's mind,
And the heart of the Eternal
Is most wonderfully kind.

But we make His love too narrow
By false limits of our own ;
And we magnify His strictness
With a zeal He will not own.§

Unless we are possessed by this thought of God's love I do not think we can enter fully into the creative dream of Jesus Christ. In some way our thought of

* See W. F. Halliday's suggestive treatment in *Reconciliation and Reality*, especially Chap. VII on "Providence" and Chap. IX on "Wrath and Punishment."

† Luke ii. 49 (R.V.), and John xiv. 2.

‡ See *The Christ of Revolution* (in this series) by J. R. Coates, pp. 62-69.

§ From the hymn, "Souls of Men," by F. W. Faber.

God has come to include a conception of hardness which does not seem to find any justification in what we see of Him in Christ. Is this due, I wonder, to a false idea of omnipotence? In dealing with free persons the strongest force must be something which wins their approval and brings their will into active willing cooperation with that of another. Any kind of force that denies love is inconsistent with the rights of personality. If, therefore, at any point in history past or future, God turns from this method of persuasion by the revelation of Himself, just to that extent does He take away from men the freedom of choice which we cannot help feeling to be a real thing. Jesus seemed to see men as having a real power of choice, and God as a Father always respecting it. Thus God's power in dealing with men is love and nothing more or less. The faith of Jesus was the faith that this power is actually a greater one than any other in producing a true social order, and that it can be relied upon to the uttermost. When we share this faith our eyes are open to see the vision for mankind that Jesus saw.*

II

The dream of Jesus for society begins, then, in His thought of God, in His consciousness of God as His Father and the Father of all. This means that the beginning of a true social order is to be *the conscious relation of all our life to God as our Father*. And this is not a static thought of society. It is an ever expanding one because our individual consciousness can never fully comprehend the nature and purposes of God and should always be growing. There always lies before us an undiscovered continent. "In this consists the Life

* Cf., *Practice of Christianity*, Chap. V, and *The Christian Ideal*, pp. 228-230. Of course this faith does not involve renunciation of all other kinds of force, but these can only be used as the instrument of love, consistently with the respect for personality which is an essential element in true love for another.

of the Ages—in an ever-increasing knowledge of Thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.”* This thought of God and our relation to Him fills the world with mystery and wonder and the joy of the unexpected. And yet it supplies that stability and steady purpose without which our lives become meaningless and our efforts for social betterment seem nothing worth. There is an end, but it is always “waiting to be revealed.” We see enough to spur us to highest endeavours, but not so much that we give up the quest as hopeless. We have a great Co-operator in all our best efforts; but we cannot leave it all to Him. He is in the thick of the fight with us in a very real sense, and for myself I am brought to the conclusion that there is, even in our Father’s scheme of things, an element of glorious uncertainty—just that something which gives spice to our thinking and zest to our work. I wonder if the experience of William James, expressed in the following letter, is not a very common one, and true to something “in the nature of things.”

“I have often thought,” he writes, “that the best way to define a man’s character would be to seek out the particular mental or moral attitude in which, when it came upon him, he felt himself most deeply and intensely active. At such moments there is a voice inside which speaks and says: ‘This is the real me?’ . . . Now, as well as I can describe it, this characteristic attitude in me always involves an element of active tension, of holding my own, as it were, and trusting outward things to perform their part so as to make it a full harmony, but without any *guaranty* that they will. Make it a guaranty—and the attitude immediately becomes to my own consciousness stagnant and stingless. Take away the guaranty, and I feel (provided I am *überhaupt* in vigorous condition) a sort of deep enthusiastic bliss, of bitter willingness to do or suffer anything, which translates itself physically by a kind of stinging pain inside my breast-bone (don’t

* John xvii. 3. Dr. Weymouth’s translation—margin.

smile at this—it is to me an essential element of the whole thing !)—and which, although it is a mere mood or emotion to which I can give no form in words, authenticates itself to me as the deepest principle of all active and theoretic determination which I possess.”*

So we may say even of the dream of Jesus, and certainly of our apprehension of it, that it is not that of a final state (whatever we may mean by such a phrase). There is an open end, as it were, and this end opens on to infinity. When we have done our utmost we have the sense of being “unprofitable servants,” and our reward will be the “glory of going on.” The material is always being improved as it is used for higher ends. It is the mystery of a divine life expressing itself in human personality and in human society. “When it was the good pleasure of God,” says Paul, “to reveal His Son in me,” and again, “My little children, of whom I am again in travail until Christ be formed in you.”† Human personalities are, in the dream of Jesus which He transmitted to His followers, the way in which the Father expresses Himself, and His power of expression must be conditioned by the vehicle He uses ; men and women are to be so developed as to be able increasingly to fulfil this function.

Relating this to the dream of social well-being, we may say that our Father’s will is to embody His thought in human society, and that we may expect, if we progress in any true way, that human society, our actual common life and organisation will be progressively transformed so that it may become more and more capable of embodying that thought. Yet this can only happen as the wills of individuals come into harmony with the will of God, and as they learn to embody goodwill and faith in their organised life. It is the nature of this change, or rather the direction in which we are to think of the change taking place, that constitutes the Creative Dream. It unfolds to us the

* *The Letters of William James*, vol. i., pp. 199-200.

† Gal. i. 15-16, and iv. 19.

possibility of our common life ; it summons us on to fresh adventures ; it gives us the power to work towards such an end, for even to dream is to yield oneself up in some measure to the Spirit of God.

III

Although the records of His life and teachings do not yield sufficient data for us to fill in every detail of the dream of Jesus for human society, we can say a good many things about it which will prove to be of great service to us when we come to consider the problem of method.* The particular expression which Jesus Christ selected in order to give concrete form to His dream was "The Kingdom of God," or "The Kingdom of Heaven." No doubt the two terms were interchangeable in His teaching, the one concentrating attention on the thought of the relation of all life to the will of God, the other on that of the community of persons living in harmony with one another. It is not well to be too closely bound by the phrase for it is clear that Jesus had to use some form of words more or less familiar and intelligible to the people, and that the really significant thing is the content with which he filled them. On five aspects of this deeper content let us dwell for awhile.

I. *In this Kingdom the Supreme Ruler is our Father.*

To grasp this fact is to gain the key to the understanding of Christ's thought of men's relations to one another. This idea is worked out in some detail in my Walker Prize Essay (Section II, *q.v.*). Here I can only summarise the argument. It is to the effect that the Kingdom is in point of fact a family, and that it is not a legal contract but a family spirit that is to hold

* For a fuller treatment of some aspects of the dream of Jesus and its practical working out I would refer the reader to *The Christian Ideal* by W. E. Wilson, in this series. See also *The Way to Personality*, (pp. 59ff.) and *The Kingship of God*, by G. B. Robson.

men and women together. This means that there will be a sharing of common interests and possessions, because we love to do this and cannot stand the idea of separateness and opposition within the family, not because we are compelled to such a sharing by the rules of a communistic state. It means true freedom and self-development for each, limited not legally but by the self-imposed limits developed in a true family. It means social justice achieved and maintained, not by an external system of coercion with rewards and punishments, but by the continual exercise of forbearance and forgiving love. "The end before humanity according to the thought of Christ, then, is that all men should come into this great family, that they should be so transformed as to make the first aim of life the doing of the Father's will. The revolution for which He worked was to begin in men's hearts, and to work outwards. From the nature of the case it could not be achieved in any other way. It would never do to set up a perfect outward order in which the system was calculated to give to all equality and liberty, to develop fraternity and to establish righteousness. Even one wayward soul in such a world would mar the whole. Such a system, developed with infinite care and patience, would yet break down if selfishness ruled in men's hearts, and their actions were dictated by private-mindedness, rather than by family love. But for Him there ever shone a splendid hope, by which He lived, and in which He died—the hope that in every man there was something which would one day, if rightly sought, respond with glad affection and utter trust to the Father's love, and that the day would yet dawn when men everywhere would be born into the Kingdom, and so, having found it in their own hearts, together set it up in the earth."*

What Jesus dreamed of was one great divine human family on earth, wherein men and women of all races and types should actually work out the family relationship. The kind of family He dreamed of was to be

* Last paragraph in Section II, Walker Essay.

determined by the nature of the Father as he knew it. "Suppose for a moment that all living beings felt permanently and universally to each other as they do now occasionally to those whom they love best. It would follow that all the pain in the world would be swallowed up in the joy of doing good." So writes Professor Nettleship. Is not this the very dream which Jesus dreamed? And is it not clear that He saw its fulfilment to be possible just in so far as those who have already been born into the family show the family spirit not only to those within the family, but equally and unswervingly to those who are as yet outside it? But this is to hurry on too quickly; we must pause to consider other aspects of Christ's creative dream.

2. The Kingdom is to be set up first in men's hearts.

This is simply to say that the only way in which the family spirit can possibly begin is in the creation of sons and daughters. These will have the Father's attitude towards life and towards one another. The reconstruction of our social order according to the mind of Christ is simply the working out of a social principle already established or being established in every true child of God. Look within and we cannot fail to find a witness to the truth, a standard for life which is the very principle we need to apply in the whole of society. God is not without a witness in every one of us. If it were not so we should be doomed to everlasting chaos. When we recognise and respond to the call of God in our own souls the Kingdom of God has already come for us. Others may scoff and tell us that we are mere dreamers, and that a world such as this is no place for us to live in. But we have the assurance that, if it be not yet, it assuredly may and shall be. For that which we know to be of universal significance has already been discovered and accepted as the law of our own life, and we can say, "I am convinced that what I can see others can see, and nothing can persuade me that the

world is not 'ready' for an ideal for which I am ready."* In the dream of Jesus, then, you have a principle of life so firmly established in the deepest experience of certain persons that it is bound to spread to others. How are you going to start upon the work of a revolution so stupendous unless you begin with men and women in whom the revolution is already working?

It is clear, then, that the dream of Jesus is to be fulfilled in the first place in the lives of men and women who have had an experience of God. To be a Christian is to see God in Jesus Christ for ourselves, to have come into a new relationship to Him and to our fellow-men. Jesus Himself stated it in the simplest language when he said, "Except one be born anew he cannot see the Kingdom of God."† Something must happen not simply *to* a man, like an outward rite, but *within* a man, if he is even to see the Kingdom, to dream the dream. The hope for society lies in the increase of the numbers of those who see, and who having seen, in the true sense, have already entered into that which they have seen.

Now this must mean the discovery on the part of the individual of a true sense of proportion, of the actual meaning of life as a whole, and the deliberate relation of himself to that which he has seen. So that it is evident that self-fulfilment, the realisation of the finest possibilities of the person, is achieved in the process by which he becomes aware of his relation to other persons, and gives himself to the realisation of the common good. If humanity is so made that we can be a true family with one Father the fulfilment of the good of each will be found and can only be found in the fulfilment of the good of all.

The life so lived radiates hope. It is small wonder that when Paul thought of the cosmic need he seemed to see "all creation gazing eagerly as if with outstretched

* *The Great Adventure*, by A. Maude Royden, p. 15.
(Fellowship of Reconciliation, 17, Red Lion Square, S.W.1.)

† John iii. 3.

neck, . . . waiting and longing to see the manifestation of the Sons of God."* The hope of a new world order could not be realised save as that world order was actually established in individual lives.

3. *The Kingdom is to be set up in this world.*

Doubtless there are passages in the teaching of Jesus which support the view that the Kingdom is something for another state of existence. But He was never careful to avoid possible misconstruction of His teaching. He threw out thoughts which might seem contradictory and which might be taken up in a wrong sense. We can only judge by the whole tenor of the teaching, and judging thus it is clear as day that Jesus had in mind a realisable possibility, something which was practicable even under the limitations of time and space and with mere human beings. The fact that Christ emphasised so strongly the inward nature of the Kingdom does not mean that it had no outward expression. That expression is an actual order of society in which the family spirit and idea shall replace the legal one, where we shall not need outward restraint because men will have within themselves a power that holds them back from anything that is unloving. We are therefore concerned with the task of giving concrete shape to our social ideals, not in order that we may impose such a form upon an unwilling world and embody the ideal in legislation and constitutions; but for such reasons as the following:—to stimulate thought in regard to the way in which the family spirit may express itself, to stir enthusiasm and effort towards that end, to unite the members of the family in seeking such ends by education, experiment, inspiration and persuasion, and so to create the kind of persons who will want to live in such a society and who will not acquiesce in any other.

4. *The Kingdom can be realised soon.*

Perhaps the chief heresy of the Church has been the deliberate postponement of the social ideal of Jesus

* Romans viii. 19. Weymouth.

Christ. There is no comparison between the danger of such a postponement and the danger of our getting into error on philosophical or metaphysical details about which none of us can have any ultimate certainty. If one thing is more certain than another about the dream of Jesus, it is that He thought of it as something which God was ever eager to translate into reality. There was no need for hesitation or delay as far as the Father was concerned. The burden of the first evangel was "The Kingdom of God is at hand." It was just this that proved so dynamic and thrilling a conception. It braced men to great efforts; it keyed them to wide-eyed expectancy; they became intensely alive with the thought of the possibilities in the midst of which they lived. Psychologically this belief that big things might happen quite soon, is surely one of the reasons that there was so much creative activity among the first Christians. The idea of the indefinite postponement of our hopes inhibits some of our finest impulses; it may leave us with patient resignation, but seldom with boundless enthusiasm. The youth who sets out upon life with a conviction that all the world will yield to his passionate efforts may be mistaken, but before he learns his mistake he does often "blow an inch into the actual." He is the creator, not his father who patronisingly tells him how hard this old world is.

Now if Jesus were mistaken in this conviction, I suppose it would be better that we should realise His mistake and set all our music in the minor key. But suppose He were right, is it not clear that we have lost something that would make all the difference to our poor tired world could we but recover it? It is my deepest conviction that He was right, and that until we recapture this element in the dream of Jesus our dreaming will just fail of being largely creative.

5. *The coming of the Kingdom is contingent on human effort.*

A certain kind of fatalism constantly creeps back into Christian thinking. There may not be many

people to-day who hold the old Calvinistic doctrine of election, but there are not a few whose thought of human life is bound up with the theory that God has planned out the whole thing, and when He wills to bring about any change in human affairs it will just happen, quite independently of any other factor in the situation. There are many who believe that the present world order must persist, or even go from bad to worse, until Christ returns in person to reign on the earth, that the only thing for His followers to do is to try and win as many individuals, "as brands from the burning," before this cosmic event takes place. Now, I have no intention of being drawn into a discussion on prophecy (in the narrower sense of foretelling), but I do feel that there must be a fatal defect in any theory that postpones the coming of the family régime in the world until after an event which has no relation to human wills. As I understand the meaning of history and the teaching of Jesus, God the Father always respects human personality. He chooses to work through it, and that not by compulsion but by persuasion. From this it would follow that the type of predeterminism I have criticised calls for action on the part of God which is fundamentally at variance with what we know in other ways of His nature and His working with men. If He has set out to lead men into the way of life is it conceivable that He should suddenly give up this method? Is it not rather true to say that the coming of Christ into the world is the very climax of this method, an entering into suffering humanity in patient endurance and passionate love, and that if the victory of such a Christ is ever to come among men it can only come through the same spirit manifested in human lives?

So we come back to the thought that it is with the response of men and women to the Father's love that the issue really lies. If the dream be that of a family, of sons and daughters living a common life of joyous fellowship, freely partaking of the good things of life, and serving one another in love, this dream's fulfilment

must be contingent on the response of men and women to their Father. This element of response it is which justifies the expression that while God is the Father of all we are not all His children, which is only another way of saying that our own acts have cut us off from that fellowship we were meant to enjoy. But however much we may thus cut ourselves off we cannot turn away the Father's love. That is changeless and there is always a way back however far men stray.

IV

But here is the patent fact. Men have strayed, and the Kingdom is delayed. The dream has not come true even after nineteen centuries. Dare we dream it again now—in the light of so great a postponement, in the light of our ghastly failure? I would answer not only that we dare, but that we must if we are to move forward at all. The world is so little moved by this dream not because it is too noble a dream, but because men have not had the courage to translate it into action, or because in trying to do so they have not taken the right means to reach the end. We who are committed to the Christian ideal have been eager to compel others to accept the good we have but partially seen, when we should have devoted ourselves to working it out far more fully in our own lives and so discovering its larger meaning. We have supposed that because society was so little like the dream of Jesus it was no use to attempt to realise more than a very little fraction of it and so we have missed the glory of the great adventure.

The other day I was trying to dream this dream again with a group of Chinese girl students. One of them voiced the opinion of others when she said: "Of course what Dr. Hodgkin talks about is very fine and beautiful, but we all know it's quite impossible." Perhaps this is the inevitable first reaction of anyone who, thinking sanely of the world as it is, dreams the

dream of Jesus for the first time. But everything really depends on whether we begin where He began or not. We may express ourselves in very different ways but there is something essential in His experience of God that cannot, I believe, be dispensed with if our dreams are to be creative. Let me give a modern illustration of this essential experience in words very different from those of Jesus yet curiously reminiscent of some of the elements in His dream that we have recalled in this chapter.

Olive Shreiner in perhaps the last thing published under her name,* pictures the way in which she came to the conviction that "no immediate gain conferred by war, however great, can compensate for the evils it ultimately entails on the human race." She describes in vivid phrases a dawn in South Africa and her experience as a child, not yet nine, in watching it and thinking over the cruelty in the world. As she looked at the "almost intolerable beauty," she says, "a curious feeling came over me. It was not what I *thought* put into exact words, but I seemed to *see* a world in which creatures no more hated and crushed, in which the strong helped the weak, and men understood each other and forgave each other, and did not try to crush others but to help. I did not think of it as something to be in a distant picture; it was there, about me, and I was in it, and a part of it. And there came to me, as I sat there, a joy such as never besides have I experienced, except perhaps once, a joy without limit."

Over against this experience she describes the thought of the world as it was sweeping in on her and the sense of her own insignificance. "What did it matter what *I* did, how *I* lifted my hand, how *I* cried out? The great world would roll on, and on, just as it had!" But this was not the end, for she proceeds to give the

* "The Dawn of Civilisation, 'Stray Thoughts on Peace and War,' 'The Homely Personal Confession of a Believer in Human Unity,' published in the *Nation* and *Athenæum*, March 26th, 1921, pp. 912-14.

crowning experience of that wondrous dawn. "And then, as I sat on there, another thought came to me ; and in some form or other it has remained with me ever since, all my life. It was like this :—You cannot by willing it alter the vast world outside of you ; you cannot, perhaps, cut the lash from one whip ; you cannot stop the march of even one armed man going out to kill ; you cannot, perhaps, strike the handcuff from one chained hand ; you cannot even remake your own soul so that there shall be no tendency to evil in it ; the great world rolls on and *you* cannot re-shape it ; but this one thing only can you do ; in that one small, minute, almost infinitesimal spot in the Universe, where your will rules, there, where alone you are as God, *strive* to make that you hunger for real ! No man can prevent you there. In your own heart strive to kill out all hate, all desire to see evil come even to those who have injured you or another ; what is weaker than yourself try to help ; whatever is in pain or unjustly treated and cries out, say, 'I am here ! I, little, weak, feeble, but I will do what I can for you.' This is all you can do ; but do it ; it is not nothing ! And then this feeling came to me, a feeling it is not easy to put into words, but it was like this :—You are also a part of the great Universe ; what you strive for something strives for ; and *nothing in the Universe is quite alone* ; you are moving on towards something.

"And as I walked back that morning over the grass slopes, I was not sorry I was going back to the old life. I did not wish I was dead and that the Universe had never existed. I, also, had something to live for—and even if I failed to reach it utterly—somewhere, sometime, some place, it was ! I was not alone."

Is there not something in this dream that is creative and dynamic ? How great the need for more of such dreaming ! Yet it is not for the chosen few alone to dream such dreams. Few of us may be able to put them into words like these, but common men and women in all nations can have a like experience, and out of it

will come creative activities. In a world where men are living in constant fear of one another, in fear of the consequences of their own actions, in fear of events that seem bound to come, where there is selfishness and pride and bitterness and narrowness of soul we may all be dreamers along with Jesus of Nazareth. Let us not be afraid of dreams! Let us not be afraid of sharing them with others! Let us not be afraid of the consequences of trying to bring them to pass! Let us not be afraid to start alone!*

For this world is surely meant to be a place of joy where fear is utterly cast out, and it is as fear is cast out of any single life that it can be cast out of society. This world is surely meant to be a place where men and women find their joy in serving one another, in little things as in great things, where they respect one another and find strength in fellowship and the performing of the tasks of love in free association, where disease and ugliness and squalor have no place and where the material is made the servant of the spiritual, where children are cared for with tenderness and patience, where the old are loved and venerated even when their foibles are unreasonable and they behave like spoilt children, where injury is met by forgiveness until seventy times seven, and where cruelty is overwhelmed by tenderheartedness, until love establishes its perfect sway in the hearts of all. And how can this dream come true if we do not let it possess our souls, if we turn away from it as a mere impossible Utopia, if we dare not begin with ourselves and allow the family spirit to control us?

Jesus dreamed this dream because "He saw in all men the Divine Light, and knew each struggling soul

* Compare the last testimony of James Nayler, "There is a spirit which I feel that delights to do no evil nor to revenge any wrong, but delights to endure all things in hope to enjoy its own in the end. Its hope is to outlive all wrath and contention and to weary out all exaltation and cruelty or whatever is of a nature contrary to itself. . . . It takes its kingdom with entreaty and not with contention, and keeps it by lowliness of mind." *Works*, p. 696.

as a child of His Father. To us there comes a vision of a new society, where men are linked together by the sense of the life of one loving spirit in all, where soul answers to soul in the healing experience of a practised brotherhood: Love in action.”*

To some it will seem that to dream like this is only to come into a world of illusions, to encourage in ourselves and others an unreal attitude to life. In the following pages I hope to show why I do not share this view. Before we come to such a discussion can we not at least remember that Jesus, with all His dreaming, made a contribution towards social betterment that is unequalled in the records of the race? And shall not we, visionaries and practical persons alike, allow ourselves to remain for a while under the spell of His wonderful dream and ask ourselves whether, if it were possible, its realisation would not indeed be worth every endeavour and sacrifice to which we might be called? Jesus thought it was worth nothing less than the Cross.

* Epistle from London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 1921.

CHAPTER III

THE WAY

THE WAY.

From the sorrow that burdens all hearts, from the dangers that threaten to overwhelm us, from the hatred and social injustice that flourish in all lands—is there a way of deliverance ?

The way to bring joy into the world is for us willingly to accept more sorrow, opening our hearts to the sorrow of other hearts all over the world. The way to bring security into the world is for us willingly to face all risks to ourselves and our possessions, and to trust all men, however untrustworthy they seem.

The way to bring in the reign of justice is not to punish wrongdoers, but to overcome evil by loving and forgiving without waiting for signs of repentance.

This is the Way of Jesus, Who Himself followed it consistently, and in so doing conquered the world, even in His death. It is the Way of Reconciliation that brings men to their Father and makes them brothers in one family.

We have not followed this Way.

We have escaped suffering and danger at the cost of pain and peril to others ; we have so failed in love that violence seemed to be the only way of defence ; we have maintained our rights when others were denied theirs ; we have perpetuated hatred instead of dispelling it by forgiveness and love. We all stand condemned before God. None can cast a stone at his brother.

To follow this Way seems like madness. But there is something in every one of us that calls us into it. It is the Spirit of God moving within us. When that Spirit rules we are free.

We cannot expect by this way to gain ease, wealth, power. We may not at once create a new world. But the Way of Christ is the one Way of Hope. It means revolution through reconciliation. Jesus is the real Revolutionary because He is the great Reconciler. If we take His Way we, too, shall be reconcilers and revolutionaries. The path lies open to every man who loves and dares. Such men are the pioneers of the Christian Revolution, and such we may all be."

From the initial statement of the Movement Towards a Christian International.

October, 1919.

CHAPTER III

THE WAY

I

IT is not, I think, without significance that the expression by which the early disciples most frequently referred to the whole system of life and thought which they proclaimed was "The Way." For them Jesus Christ had not only dreamed a dream so beautiful and compelling that they had made it the aim of their lives; He had also shown them the way by which that dream was to come true. Nothing was more important to them than this discovery or revelation. It was a new thing in their experience. The goal could be reached and to them had been shown the secret, the mystery hidden from the foundation of the world, the way by which it could be gained. This way they saw exemplified in the Cross of Christ, and therefore it became the centre of all their preaching. It was a way that seemed utterly foolish to the wise Greeks and even abhorrent to the orthodox Jews, but to those who made the discovery for themselves it was a way of supreme wisdom and efficacy.* It was the highest kind of politics and the most daring kind of revolution.

The Way was not only a way to what we call "personal salvation," it was the Way to a social order utterly different from that in which they lived. These men and women were already "a colony of heaven" † in order that the Kingdom of Heaven might be realised on earth. "Just as the Roman colonists at Philippi would regard it as folly to adopt the inferior customs and laws of their neighbours, because they were copying

* See I Cor. i. 21-24.

† See Phil. iii. 20. Moffatt's translation.

the better standard of Rome, so the Christian Church must not descend to the principles and conduct and customs of the world, it must live by the higher principles and truer customs of Heaven, revealed in Jesus Christ."* Through such living, even at the risk of persecution, misunderstanding and death, these men were to make their distinctive contribution to the new world order.

If Christ saw one thing more clearly than another, if anything can be singled out as the most startling fact in His life as contrasted with that of the founders of other religions or philosophies, it would seem to me to be His clear vision of the relation of means to end, and His unswerving acceptance of all the consequences of following only that method which was consistent with the end in view. The story of the temptation in the wilderness is His characteristic way of letting His friends into something of what the inner struggle meant.† We can see it written in page after page of the gospels; when He left the crowd who sought Him to go to other villages also; when He turned from the multitude who would make Him king, and followed the incident with teaching calculated to turn many away; when He devoted Himself to the little group of disciples and tried to prepare them for His sufferings and death; when the Greeks came to see Him at the feast; when He wrestled alone in the Garden of Gethsemane. All along it was the same story the choice of a lonely and difficult path, misunderstood and rejected, betrayed and denied, mocked and crucified, yet never for an instant turning from the Way. It is this "Way which they style a heresy,"‡ as Paul says, that is still so largely untried even by those who are named by the name of Christ. It is this Way I want to analyse and explain in relation to the actual problem of creating, here and

* W. E. Wilson, *A Colony of Heaven*, p. 5. Fellowship of Reconciliation.

† For a study of the significance of this struggle in the light of the social ends of Jesus see my article in *The Venturer*, October, 1915, on "Essentials," and *cf. Practice of Christianity*, pp. 35-43.

‡ Acts xxiv. 14. Weymouth's translation.

now, an order of society in accordance with the dream of Christ.

The key to the Way of Jesus is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount and in many other parts of His teaching and parables. I cannot make detailed reference to all this mass of material.* All I can do is to state the conclusions to which I have come, and leave any readers who question them to compare what I have written with the recorded sayings of Jesus. Above all we should compare the conclusions with His life, and see whether it be not true that this Way was not only the Way He recommended, but, far more significant, the Way He took. I maintain that this is so and that the arch-heresy is not in our credal mis-statements, but simply that we have not taken His Way. Until men repent of this error and begin to take the Way there is no chance of our realising His dream.

That the Sermon on the Mount is mainly an exposition of the means rather than of the end is clear from the fact that it all along presupposes the presence of persons who are not showing the family spirit. The men who have that spirit will be "persecuted for righteousness' sake." They are as salt in an obviously unsalted mass, as lights in a world that needs to be lighted. They are given instructions about alms-giving, clearly showing a world in which there is still a wrong distribution of wealth. They are to meet with those who smite them on the cheek, and who steal their possessions. They are to beware of false teachers—and so forth all the way through. These then are not what we call "counsels of perfection" for an indefinite future. These are not the laws for a Kingdom that has not yet come, and so without any immediate validity. This body of teaching is the explanation of the way in which the man who has the family spirit will actually live in a world which has not, in the main, got that

* For a careful study of the Sermon on the Mount in this connection I would recommend especially *The Way to Personality*, Part II.

spirit. That is to say, we have here illustrated the kind of life which Jesus calls His hearers to live in a world not yet ready for this type of living. The obvious folly of utter truthfulness in a world of lies, of spotless purity in an unclean society, of childlike trust among men who are always ready to take advantage of one, of boundless generosity towards unworthy persons, and fearless forgiveness in the face of continual wrong—all this Jesus knew quite well. I say it reverently—He was no fool. But I want to ask a quite straight question: Does not the prevailing moral temper *in the Church* write Him down as one? Do not our pulpits and theological schools echo with such expressions as “all very well as an ideal,” which simply means utterly impossible as a Way of Life, or “of course we must adapt it to circumstances,” which is another way of saying that we dare not try out, in all its naked simplicity, the Way of the Cross?

Now I hold that what Jesus saw was simply this, that until men and women did try out this Way there was no hope of His Kingdom being established, but that by this Way, it could be reached even in an amazingly short time. It was not a question of two equally good methods, one of which was a little bit harder than the other, or a little bit more direct. It was a question of choosing the only method that could succeed for the end in view. We shall have to consider shortly some of the other methods men follow, and why these cannot, from the very nature of the case, succeed. Here we are concerned rather in trying to see the positive value of the method of Jesus and how it will work out in a general way.

There are probably few of my readers who will defend the proposition that the end justifies the means. But in practice how many of us act as if we believed it. There is one sense in which it may be said to apply, but that is a very limited one. It is true to say that if a man devotes himself with a pure motive to a high end, the fact that he chooses a method inconsistent with the attainment of the end does not take away from

the moral value of his devotion. It is often because men do not see the distinction between this meaning of the phrase and the wider and false one, that they hesitate to throw over even so evil a method as war. It seems like a reflection on the devoted spirit of those who have died for a great cause. But even such devotion cannot make the method of war effective for creating the divine-human family. If that is the end we choose we must be equally bold in discarding wrong methods and in selecting right ones.

Jesus evidently saw that many men would be found to bless His ideal who would shrink from taking His Way. They would hear His words (and this with Jesus meant intelligent appreciation and even acceptance of them "in principle"), but would shrink from applying them in any full, unhesitating way. They would not allow themselves to be called dreamers. They were the realists who saw life as it really was, good, sober, prudent, practical men, the backbone of a well-ordered society and a compromising church! Jesus called these wise men fools. It was the fools who stepped out into the untried way that all their prudent friends knew would lead to disaster, whom Jesus called wise, and likened to the man who built his house upon the rock. This rock was the unshakeable love of God, which He knew to be absolutely trustworthy, the one basis on which human society could be permanently erected.

Now the distinction Jesus made between these two men was not that one was a better man than the other, but that the one succeeded and the other failed! Our common political wisdom might admit the one to be a better man, but we should be equally certain in assuring him that he was sure to fail. So he would—in one sense of the word. He would not become rich or powerful or influential or popular. His life might even end in ignominy and defeat as the life of Jesus did, or seemed to. But that is not the question. Would he be helping to build the new social order? Is such a life one that really is, in fact as well as in intention,

seeking first the Kingdom of God? Jesus clearly thought it was, and He thought it so deeply that He staked His life on this conviction.

The particular point at issue is well stated by Mencius, who seems to have come very close to Christ's conception of the method of social progress. He says "Benevolence subdues its opposite just as water subdues fire. Those, however, who, in these days, practise benevolence, do so as if with one cup of water they could save a whole wagon-load of burning fuel, and when the flames were not extinguished should say that water cannot subdue fire. Such conduct, indeed, greatly encourages those who are not benevolent. *Its final result is ruin!"* Is not the enemy of all true progress the man who takes a few hesitating steps in the right direction, and then turns back because he does not at once succeed? If love can overcome evil let us try it out *to the uttermost*. Is not this the real challenge of Jesus Christ?

II

At the risk of repetition let us get this point perfectly clear. There is a view of human progress that concentrates attention on the slow, age-long process through which, little by little, moral gain has been achieved by the race. We are reminded of the fact that it took many centuries of Christian teaching before slavery was seen to be contrary to the Christian ethic, and was actually abolished by the so-called Christian States. Very slowly and painfully are we

* Book VI, Part I, Chapter 18. He adds a little later "He who seeks to be rich will not be benevolent; he who wishes to be benevolent will not be rich." The question as to whether the word "benevolence" (*ren*) had as deep a content for Mencius as "love" had for Christ is not relevant to the use I make of this passage. The final definition of the word love I have not attempted, feeling that only a life can really define it, and that life is for me, above all others, that of Jesus of Nazareth. See, however, the note in *Lay Religion*, p. 220.

coming to see what the Christian ideals of personal worth and human fellowship really involve. If one small gain can be achieved in our common life in this generation it is all we can expect. To hope for anything more is to shut our eyes to the lessons of history, and to be wilfully blind to the facts of human nature. This view we may call the "evolutionary" view of social progress.

The effect of this view upon Christian thinking is simply that we do not think it possible or wise to be too far ahead of our time. Of course we must be a little in advance. We must move towards the one goal which all right-minded persons accept, but if we move too fast we shall simply "upset the apple-cart." This view is peculiarly attractive because it fits in with our human frailty. It excuses men from a heroism that may end in disaster and from a fanaticism that will certainly not be popular. Its devotees, while often not consciously insincere, are among those who seek to "harmonise their ideals with their own mediocrity."* "They continually seek after new formulæ by which to bring the Kingdom of God nearer to the kingdoms of this world. They always find some way of explaining the Gospel of Jesus as applicable merely to His own time, thereby robbing it of all its peculiar virtue and force. They defend capitalism, they defend war. They always manage to find a new formula to justify in the eyes of religion whatever the world finds good. Hence they are more dangerous than the professed representatives of the world. And so it is with all the progress of the Kingdom of God; it is retarded less by the world than by a Christianity that allies itself with the world."†

A recent example of this false theorising which serves to deprive Christ's demand on men of its real "bite" is to be found in Professor Urwick's *Philosophy of Social Progress*. Along with much that seems to me valuable and suggestive he develops an amazing

* M. Romain Rolland, *Above the Battle*, p. 105.

† Professor Ragaz, "Letter to Dr. Traub, of Dortmund, published in *Goodwill*, 29th March, 1915, pp. 57ff.

theory of the human personality that I can only regard as most dangerous and delusive. By dint of dividing men's actions into those which express the social self, fashioned largely by environment, and those which express the soul or true individual, he arrives at a theory of social responsibility that, while it seems to resolve the problems of the relation of the individual to the community, creates a far more difficult one by dividing the personality and taking away the moral imperative of the awakened conscience in relation to the larger part of life. I cannot, of course, do full justice to his argument in this brief reference, but I can take his own words in order to show where it leads him. His "really good individual . . . will not resist the social will by raising his head against it at every point where he believes it to be mistaken. He knows that the perfecting of the social condition is an endless process, and therefore very slow; it is also a process of improvement by trial and mistakes and experience slowly acquired from the consequences of mistakes; above all, he knows that the steps in the process are not *his* secret, nor revealed to him, any more than are the steps of nature's processes. Therefore he willingly submits to the demands of his society, only protesting against the non-moral and non-spiritual elements of the dominant aim. Is a war decided upon? To him it may seem quite certainly a mistaken war; but he will fight by the side of his fellow-citizens, and die in the fight willingly. Is a policy chosen which offends all his social opinions? None the less will he submit to it cheerfully as a loyal citizen should."*

The point is made clear in the contrast to which I am bound to take most emphatic exception. "As selves, and still more as social persons, we owe a debt to nature and society to which it is hard to assign any limits. As souls we owe no debt at all. As selves we owe society a willing submission; and society has authority over most of our social activities and

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 186-7.

self-activities and interests.”* No one would dream of suggesting that this elaborate argument is deliberately set up in order to make life easy for those who accept it. But the effect of it seems to me certain to be in that direction, and it appears to me to be a turning aside from the Way as set forth by Jesus Christ.†

The subtle poison of this whole type of thinking has entered into so much of our religious writing and preaching that it takes a considerable effort for any of us to clear ourselves from it and to see exactly what is wrong. We seem compelled to overstate the other view if it is to awaken our dormant souls at all. Let us begin by admitting that human history does show only a very slow progress in the understanding and application of ethical ideas in society. Let us further insist that it is not only progress that is seen, but also frequent degeneration and serious lapses, that it is impossible to map history by means of a continuous curve, however gentle, to mark the upward sweep. It is an interrupted and often a very seriously interrupted curve with which we have to deal. But now let us further ask what it is that has made progress possible. I should answer this question by stating that progress has only been possible because of the emergence of revolutionary spirits, isolated men and women and groups of men and women who have not been content with the slow, upward climb, but have risen on wings as eagles, who have been so much before their time that they have been called madmen and fools, but whose folly has been the most potent factor in creating the new moral atmosphere into which the world has occasionally moved on.

It was not a slow progress of thought but the divine act and sacrifice of Telemachus, a fool for Christ's sake, who threw away his life instead of wisely sparing it to write pamphlets and preach sermons by the

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 186-7.

† A similar division is set up by Bishop Temple, and is very effectively dealt with in *Christ and Cæsar*, Chapter III. See also the final chapter in that volume.

hundred, that abolished the gladiatorial contests. It was not the arguments from pulpits by compromising preachers, but the utterly devoted life of a John Woolman, who was quite outrageous in the way in which he applied his principles, that was the chief factor in creating a new world conscience on the question of human slavery. And so we might go on illustrating from one reform after another the patent fact that the history of the race might have been a downward curve had it not been for men and women who followed the revolutionary way of the Cross.

To what extent this Way has actually been followed in Christian history is shown in two books in this series. Dr. C. J. Cadoux's *Early Christian Attitude to War* shows in a convincing and masterly way how the teaching of Jesus and the apprehension of it in the first three Christian centuries by the great leaders of the Church call for a revolutionary attitude towards this particular social evil. Prof. Rufus M. Jones, in *The Remnant*, has traced the true succession of the apostles, of the early Christian revolutionaries, through small, despised and often persecuted groups, of whom the world (and the Church) was not worthy. In both these volumes we are summoned back from the way of thought which has so largely infected us, to something more fearless and forthright. The latter author sums up the position, describing the early Quakers, in the following pregnant sentences:—"It takes immense faith to swing out thus from the main social current of the world on an unique venture like that, to make an experiment in the practice of love when everybody else insists that nothing will work but *force*. It means flying in the face of hard facts. It is a course of action which 'common-sense' at once refuses. It involves putting into practice the laws of the Kingdom of God before that Kingdom has really come. It is a method which 'passes understanding,' and more or less defies the long-established habits of the race. These Friends, however, were absolutely convinced that God had

opened to them the true way of life—His divine way—and had called them to be the pioneers of it in the modern world. They realised only too clearly that the Kingdom of God had not come, but they had an inward sense that it *never would come* until somebody believed in its principles enough to try them out in actual operation. They resolved to go forward then, and make the experimental trial, and take the consequences.”* That very many obscure souls are constantly acting in this way I do not for a moment question. What I do say is that “orthodox” religion has not so construed the demand of Christ, at any rate since the first three centuries, and that in our common life we have not seriously considered what it might mean.

There are always a hundred arguments in favour of adjustment to the world as it is, for “some considerable postponement of the Christian ideal,”† but it is not those who thus argue who have been the pioneers of social progress. The world of to-day has no place for these timid souls. Our long experiment of skilful compromising has ended in colossal disaster—a disaster that could have been foretold with certainty because it was inherent in the way we chose to go. There may be many failures and many set-backs if we set out upon the other way, but they will be in the line of true progress, accidents in the open-road, instead of explosions in a blind alley.

Before we go forward to the consideration of what this Way means in detail it is necessary to reiterate our fundamental conviction that to take this Way we must start where Jesus started, with a conviction of God that radiates as the central fact in our experience. “We cannot read the sayings of Jesus about faith,” says Professor Cairns, “with any insight or imagination, or lay hold of them with the faintest faith as true for our own day without the whole world around us becoming luminous with God. . . . That sense of God, as

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 141-2. See also *The Arm of God*, by Roderic and Erica Dunkerley, Oliphants.

† P. T. Forsyth, *The Christian Ethic of War*, p. 27.

it deepened, would bring with it a spiritual climate in which it was impossible for timidity or despair to live. They would die away as the lichens and mosses of the great ice age died away before the oncoming warmth and light of the age that followed. . . . To the writer it seems that the real issue before the Church is whether she has to believe a great deal less in God than she has done, or a great deal more, and it does not seem doubtful, in such an alternative of the spirit, which is the path of Jesus of Nazareth.”*

This, too, is the issue for humanity. If this larger faith in God’s love and power is to come in the world at large it will be created not by men who talk eloquently or write convincingly, but by men who live dangerously. That is the Way of Jesus in the life of the individual.

III

We may now consider the further problem as to how this type of living is actually to affect social change. Have we only said that individual saints are the salt of the earth? To say this would be worth saying, but it is not the main purpose of this volume. We have to find out by what process, in the thought of Christ, the difficult transition is to be made from the personal to the corporate life, how men may not only be revolutionised but become social revolutionaries in the Christian sense. Grant that the chief end of society is to create personalities possessed by love, we have yet to ask, How may society fulfil this aim? Given a few such persons by what means are they going to alter society so that it may be an instrument for creating not armies of discontented, ill-educated and quarrelsome persons, but joyous, well-developed and peaceable ones? There are three main directions in which we may look for the answer to this question, and I will call them association, infection and experiment. Let us deal with them in that order.

* D. S. Cairns, article on “Hope,” *International Review of Missions*, January, 1916.

Association.

A great deal has been written lately about the way of fellowship as a Christian method for finding and working out the divine will.* To many the discovery has come with such startling freshness as to constitute a new gospel. I even fear that it may be over-emphasised in such a way as to make those who come under the influence of these movements less ready to stand alone, somewhat timid in thinking out alone what may be their personal duty as distinct from that which may be shown to the group. Having uttered this caution I am free to state my deep conviction that the method of association is one of the most vital elements in the creative activities of the sons and daughters of God—an association which recognises the Father's presence and derives its significance from this fact.

It is quite evident that the problems of our common life are so complex, and that their solution demands so large an equipment of knowledge and experience that no one person, even though illuminated by the Spirit of Truth, can expect to work out their solution in isolation. Jesus Christ took great pains to gather around Him a group of persons with different points of view and from different walks of life, and to bind them together in an intimate relationship of mutual trust and affection. He was, during His life-time, the centre of the group and He promised His continued presence by His living Spirit, after He had passed from their sight. This group, it was, that began the working out of the principles of Jesus in the social order. Their first experiment was communism, a communism, be it observed, that was the obvious and natural outcome of the new spirit. Its apparent failure is far less significant than the fact that it was adopted at once, and for a while succeeded. Into this group others were always coming. It was essentially missionary in its activities, and was bound together by the fact that all were engaged

* See, e.g., "The Way of Fellowship," by Five Free Churchmen. *The Way Forward for the Church.*

on a common task. Another very significant fact is the progressive understanding of truth that was given to the group, as seen especially in their enlarging conception of the place of Gentiles in the Christian fellowship (its international or catholic character).

If it be true, and who can doubt it? that the Lord has "more light and truth yet to break forth out of His holy word," it becomes a matter of first importance for us to consider by what means this light is to be discovered. In my opinion the most important means is through patient united thinking on the part of revolutionary Christians. In this I include vocal prayer, and still more important silent prayer, and the keenest discussion of every question. In my own experience nothing has been more fruitful for this purpose.

It has, for nearly three centuries, been the method used by the Society of Friends. That small body of Christians has tried to discover the divine will in a type of meeting and discussion that has, until recently, been tried, as far as I can discover, in no other religious community. No votes are taken and no resolutions are moved. Nevertheless decisions are reached, often through very grave differences of opinion. The actual organised life of the whole community has always been carried on in this way, and there is not the least disposition to change it for any "more business-like method" for the simple reason that it works.

The underlying assumption is that the Spirit of God is a present factor guiding to a right conclusion, that His will may be known if those who gather have patience and mutual forbearance, that as their hearts are turned to Him He will make His presence known and bring order out of disorder, harmony out of divergence. The meeting begins in silence. All hearts are thus turned to God, inward peace is secured, the private judgment is brought into relation to the larger purpose of life. It may be that some words of prayer are heard, but these will be simply the expression of a common aspiration that cannot be kept in, not the set form of

prayer or anything that is felt to be "required" before the meeting can properly begin. The only human guidance comes from a clerk who introduces the subject for discussion and records what he believes to be the judgment or "weight" of the meeting. There is perfect freedom of discussion for man and woman alike, as they may be led. At such time as he thinks fit the clerk introduces a "minute" recording the decision. If this is acceptable, as is usually the case, it will be agreed to at once, and the next business will be taken. If some question it, further discussion will be allowed, or time may be given for more silence or for vocal prayer. The minute may not express the views of all, but it will be accepted by all as a record of the meeting's decision, and all will be loyal to it. That is to say the meeting does not wait for unanimity, but proceeds along the course which seems most strongly supported by "weight" which may not always mean majority rule. The assumption that the meeting is under divine leadership is often remarkably confirmed. Many a time, on what seems to be a subject impossible to agree upon, unity is reached. Sometimes a majority will waive a point to a minority, and there will be good feeling all round, when a vote would certainly have left a number of aggrieved persons. The discussion is not an attempt by each party simply to vindicate its own view; it is a common search for truth, which means that one is at least as anxious to find out what is true in another's point of view as to state one's own. The uniting power of silence with a common conviction that the Spirit of God is in the midst and is a unifying influence, is sometimes most remarkable. In such a stillness, following a prolonged discussion that seems to "lead nowhere," a creative or reconciling thought may be given to some person and not infrequently to several persons independently. It is scarcely possible to convey the electric impression that sometimes passes through such an associated group during or after such a silence.

I have felt it worth while to describe this method fully, being one well tried and often experienced in most perplexing situations by myself, as it seems to illustrate better than anything else I could write the extraordinary value of association in the endeavour to discover the Father's will for His family on earth. In the Student Christian Movement, in Free Churches and Anglican Fellowships, in the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and in several other movements of like spirit, this method or some adaptation of it has become an ordinary method of working during recent years. It is, of course, no prerogative of the Society of Friends. During recent years I have used this method in small groups of persons of many different denominations, and it has proved fruitful again and again in facing actual problems in social reconstruction or in international action. It wants some courage to introduce it among those who are accustomed only to putting through resolutions and amendments and majority votes. It may not seem to be "democratic" but it is a method of holding your "democracy" together that seems to me to be unsurpassed; and it makes in my view for much surer progress, because it leaves no resentful groups, and it makes allowance for the fact that God often reveals Himself to a few pioneers rather than to the whole group. The dissenting or advancing minority is far less likely to be crushed.*

It certainly needs great patience and perseverance, but it would perhaps be well if our ordinary methods called for more of these qualities, and it were not so fatally easy to make "rapid progress" without due consideration for the views and feelings of the unconvinced. When it comes to the really big things the Christian fellowship is out to do, it seems to me that a large use of this method is our one hope of making really important discoveries, and that the element of

* Since writing the above I have had my attention drawn to "The New State," by M. P. Follett, in which this idea is worked out from a somewhat different point of view and most suggestively.

silence should be a large one, speech being limited to the utterance of a truth that burns in one's heart and will not be kept in. If this method were boldly tried as a solution for industrial and international problems we should be on the way towards the fulfilment of the first part of the dream of Jesus the conscious relation of the whole of life to the Father's will. One thing it must surely do—it must help us to get away from the region of personal bitterness and recrimination, and it must help us to see that larger purpose of good that will include all that any group or person really needs, giving us a root principle of agreement instead of a mere method of temporary adjustment.

It may be well to make clear before proceeding to the next point who are the group or groups who can be thus associated. I am thinking primarily, as I have said, of revolutionary Christians, in the sense defined above. It seems to me that the Church was meant by Christ to be such a group, and that the common viewpoint and the missionary spirit supply the "agreement" that He predicates as the condition for answered prayer.* Nevertheless, I believe the method is capable of a wider extension and I could quote instances where it has been applied in what are (falsely) called secular things. In the first place the Christian fellowship should use this method continually for the discovery of the Divine will in regard to the social problems the world is facing. In the second place, where suitable opportunity offers it should be used in wider circles, but care should be taken to see that some are present who have actual experience of it and who will bring the right spirit into the gathering. This also I say from actual trial during the past few years.

I do not wish it to be assumed that what I have here written exhausts all that might be said under the heading of association. In conversation between two or three, in correspondence, in all kinds of gatherings where there is a spirit of fellowship and enquiry and above all in

* Matt. xviii. 19.

common action (a point to which we return in a few pages) the method of association is immensely fruitful. It is the first step in bringing the spirit of revolution which has gripped the individual into relation to the common life. The hermit is not only an anachronism, but he is a sign of atavism. The object of individual well-being is social well-being, just as the object of social well-being is individual well-being. So the first expression of the passion for social righteousness which may be born in any individual is his association with other like-minded persons, not indeed persons of identical opinions who will make a little clique of faddists; but persons who have been gripped by the same spirit, who know what it is to say "We agree in all but opinions," and who value and use to the full their differences in knowledge, experience, and viewpoint. An associated group of this kind is *the Church* in the thought of Christ. Whatever its rites or its relation to organised Christianity, it has the authentic marks of the Church if it is dreaming Christ's dream and associated under His leadership in the fearless endeavour to put it into practice.

We have become so accustomed to think of the association of individuals in terms of big outward organisations, States, Churches, Trades Unions or what not, that it is not easy for many people, if they have not personal experience of other types of association, fully to appreciate the richness and the possibilities of the kind of association I am trying to describe. It perhaps resembles more nearly the guilds of the Middle Ages than any present industrial organisation. The State, with its legal system and its assumption of unlimited authority over the lives of its citizens, is the very antithesis of such an association. The Church, to a very large extent, has copied the State pattern, and its close organisation, its creeds and rites, its set-apart ministry and its position as a great owner of property, seem far enough away from the primitive association of friends who were of "one heart and soul so that none

of them claimed any of his possessions as his own," who "with one accord, and breaking bread in private houses, took their meals with great happiness and single-heartedness, praising God and being regarded with favour by all the people."* The Trade Union in the same way has departed far from its early pattern the Craft Guild of the Middle Ages, which, with its spontaneous association for social ends, in some ways approaches nearer to the type I have in mind than most modern organisations.

Such associations as I have in mind may or may not become an organised group. On the one hand it seems difficult to see how it can function in society and how it can do continuous work unless it has some form of organisation. On the other hand, it is clear that in the great majority of cases organisation tends to stereotype the expression of life, and in the end even to kill the very life which has created the organisation. So the world becomes littered with dead and dying organisations, and half the eager life of mankind (perhaps much more) is poured, like a trickle of fresh water lost in a great desert, into the hopeless task of trying to make them live again. Each group must discover how to express itself in the way that will be most fruitful for social ends, and will as little as possible cramp or destroy the living principle that has brought it into existence. The chief requisite, in order that the real life of the group may be maintained, is the constant recognition of and reliance upon the Spirit of Truth who will lead on to ever larger views of Truth. If this is coupled with a keen sense of social service we may expect the group to show a growing power to know and do the will of God. Groups of this kind have the authentic marks of the true church. They do not need to quote a past authority however venerable. They speak and act with an authority that is evident to all who have ears to hear and eyes to see.

* Acts iv. 34 and ii. 46,7 (Weymouth). See Chapter VI on "The Demand for Fellowship" in *Lay Religion*.

IV

Infection.

I have chosen this word, in spite of its associations, because I can find no other which so well expresses what I have in mind, unless it were the equally unsatisfactory word, contagion. Why is it, I wonder, that we have no word which is specially designed to express the idea of the spread of good from one to another as men catch a disease? It is something more than influence, it is a kind of radiation of joy and hope and enthusiasm and love. It does not depend on deliberate effort on the part of the good man, nor is it proportionate to his education, his eloquence or his skill in argument. It leaps like a flame from one to another; like a disease it can be caught from a child as thoroughly as from an adult; it depends on the virulence of the germ rather than on the qualities of the host. The word magnetism is sometimes used to give the sense, yet it is essentially a life-process and for that reason I prefer the word infection even in spite of the connection with disease. Let us then boldly use that word and try to give to it the connotation we desire. Let us read it in connection with these lines from Myers' St. Paul:

Yet not in solitude if Christ anear me
 Waketh Him workers for the great employ,
 Oh, not in solitude, if souls that hear me
 Catch from my joyaunce the surprise of joy.

Every revolutionary Christian, and in particular every group of such persons, ought to be then an infective centre always creating in others the same spirit. The missionary spirit must inspire the group or it will surely cease to fulfil any useful purpose in society. But we must, at this point, take time to consider what the missionary spirit really is, for it is unfortunately quite possible to use this phrase in a very wrong sense. The missionary spirit, then, in the sense in which I use the words, can have nothing of the spirit of domination or coercion, it has nothing of patronage or superiority, it is not concerned with making

proselytes, but with proclaiming truth. For, in the first place, domination (in the sense in which I use the term) means the overawing of one personality by another which is inconsistent with respect for the other. The spirit of service, in which alone any missionary work can be done, is the precise opposite of this. Yet, when we go to people or races who seem less enlightened or less advanced than ourselves, how extremely easy it is to take the position of master without in the least wishing to do so! The type of forceful personality that makes the best propagandist is the very one which is most liable to fall into this cardinal error.*

In the second place, even if we avoid the more obvious danger of domination we may convey a sense of superiority in our tones and gestures. We give our message from what we choose to regard as a higher moral platform. It is well that we should often remind ourselves that moral judgments are dangerous in the extreme, and that a man stands or falls by the extent to which he has followed the Light that has been given to him, rather than by the absolute amount of illumination. A capitalist who has never seen the social implications of the Gospel may be a better man than a social idealist who, having seen them, has allowed himself to get into a harsh and bitter frame of mind. A soldier who has given his all, even to so terrible a work as slaying his fellow men, may be a better man than one who, having seen the divine way of peace, presumes to judge the moral quality of the soldier's sacrifice as inferior to his own sacrifice for peace.

In the third place the proselytising spirit must be avoided because it puts membership in a party or sect in front of the spiritual interests of the person. We may rightly try to persuade a man to associate himself with some group because we feel that it will contribute to his own highest good and enable him to serve the good of others. But we need to be very watchful lest

* Cf. W. E. Wilson's *Christian Ideal*. Chapter VII, on "Domination and Service."

we *identify* any such group or its interests with those of the Kingdom of God, or care so much to increase the size and strength of the group as to make it an end in itself. The missionary spirit is not concerned with the statistics of an organisation, or the tabulated "results" of its efforts. Its one aim is to create in men's hearts the same joy and love that has infected our own. Thus it is that the true missionary's most effective weapon is his unconscious influence, and he is ever watchful lest by an unthinking act of impatience or an unthinking word of patronage, he may undo the preaching of the finest and truest sentiments.*

"We can, perhaps, best understand the missionary spirit by comparing it with the war spirit. The first sees the vision of a universal good; the second sees the vision of humanity ranged in two parties, the good of the one necessitating the injury of the other. The first counts property a slave to be used in the service of mankind; the second regards it as a deity to which human sacrifice must, on occasion, be made. The missionary spirit is universal love seeking to enlarge its sphere by service. When pure it will have no protection and no weapon but the love of God; it will hold every particular material possession only for the purpose of service. This is what underlies the Christian ideal of the Church. It has never been realised in the Church, because she has never conquered and cast out the war spirit of this world-order. . . . The Church did, indeed, once, half-unconsciously, accept her Lord's standard as her ideal, but only so long as she regarded the military and commercial and social systems of the day as doomed to swift destruction. The inspiration of that early time has remained, however, for two thousand years the real Garden of Eden lost by disobedience: the visions of light and beauty revealed in

* For a fuller treatment of this subject I would refer the reader to my Swarthmore Lecture, entitled, *The Missionary Spirit and the Present Opportunity*. Reliance on unconscious influences should never excuse us from active publication of truth. Each element is needed to enforce the other.

the literature of the New Testament have an inexhaustible fascination for mankind. . . . This missionary spirit of which we are speaking is the love that is always ardent to forgive the enemy, to do good to the injurious, to be tender-hearted to the spiteful ; for it the greatest evil will be hardness-of-heart—taking shape in the desire in any way to injure, to weaken or detract from, any of its fellow creatures that lie, and must always lie, in the bosom of what it recognises as the character of the Godhead—Love.”*

The Christian revolutionary group then must act by means of infection on the surrounding multitude. At this stage I am not concerned to discuss the possible uses of coercion in the restraint of evil. † What I am urging is that the only method which is admissible as a means of creating a new world is one that is an expression of love, the patient endurance of evil, the triumphant assertion of good, and that this method, boldly followed, is infective, and does awaken in others a response of love, whereas coercion is absolutely sterile as a means of reaching this end. There is a pessimism abroad which assumes that evil has a greater infective power than good. This view is nourished by the plain fact that much of our so-called good is not of the infective type. It is the dead-sea fruit of prohibitions and inhibitions. The good that will infect men is something quite other than this. It is the glorious, fearless, expanding life of the Son of Man, dedicated to a great end, it is true, with a dedication that cost Him many a pleasure and even life itself, but never regretful or resentful or impatient, and able to pray for His friends in the hour of deepest sorrow “ That they may have *my joy* complete within them.” ‡ The fact is that there is nothing in all the universe more potent in its infective quality than the type of goodness we see in Jesus, as witness the enduring power of His life. Can we not recapture this?

* *The Practice of Christianity* pp. 274-5, 9.

† For treatment of this question see later, pp. 110-116.

‡ John xvii. 13 (Moffatt).

Experiment.

The Christian Revolutionary group will not be content with the proclamation of a message, and with devoting itself to the painstaking effort to enlarge the content of that message and relate it to social needs. It will have the spirit of adventure, and this means that it will always be making fresh trials of its central principles in relation to the many problems of individual and social life. Such experiments will be the necessary outcome of the type of association I have described, and they will be one of the chief means by which the missionary spirit can work. For very many the illumination will come not because they hear a word spoken but because they see a word incarnate. The incarnation of to-day must often be corporate endeavour for there are many of the most perplexing questions that cannot be solved by isolated action, they await the daring experimentation of a revolutionary group.

The pioneer spirit is not content, then, with theorising, it must press out into undiscovered country and see for itself what it is like. And it will not be nearly so much concerned with getting other people to follow in the trail that it has blazed as to get to work with the main job of blazing new trails. Its contribution will be to push on so far ahead of the multitude that the latter can see how well worth while it is to go forward, rather than to drag an unwilling crowd along to the next stage when they are by no means convinced that there is anything worth securing at the end of the road.

The simile suggests the capital error of the Christian reformer. He has been determined to make the world better, a very laudable object, no doubt; but he has failed very often to see that this object can only be achieved by persuading the world that it is worth while to be better. And it is much more likely to be gained by the daring experiment of those who go the whole way, than by arguing about the advantages of taking one step.

A few months ago I was travelling through Western China, where no steam engine or motor-car has ever been seen. The road took me over mountains and across plains, winding in and out among the rice fields, a narrow steep rough road in many places. Suppose a society were to be formed for introducing motor-traction into the province. It might turn its attention to the main road along which I travelled, some three hundred miles in length, and begin by making it a little wider, by improving the gradients and rounding the corners. Thousands of pounds could be spent on it, and no doubt it would be a great deal more convenient for the present traffic. But it would still be wholly unsuitable for motor-traffic, and immense obstacles would have to be faced from farmers, landowners and taxpayers who would fail altogether to see that any great good was being achieved. On the other hand, such a society might put its available resources into a small section of the road where the problem of shifting some particular product pressed heavily. They might set about the task of engineering an entirely new road, buying up the necessary land and seeing that no one suffered in the process. They might then start a motor-transport service over their new road and so prove for all to see that the new method of transport was more economical and efficient than the old. Suppose this proved to be the case, the actual experiment on a small scale would do far more to convince the people of the value of the innovation than the spending even of vast sums on improvements in the whole length of the old road which still fell short of making it suitable for motor-traffic. This is the nature of the difference between the way of Christian social reform and the way of the Christian Revolution. The one is concerned with making the community a little better here and a little better there, always "moving it on" towards an ideal it has not seen and often setting up a latent antagonism which need never have been aroused. The other is concerned with working out in the small group,

among those who have seen the ideal and are ready to die for it, the full implications of the way of love, until society itself begins to see what a splendid aim it is, and is converted to an enthusiasm to overcome all obstacles in reaching it.

Much of what I have still to say concerns the illustration of this method in different departments of life and from actual instances that have, in many cases, come under my personal knowledge. But I should like here to urge that the alternative method has not been justified by its results, and is, as a simple matter of fact, foredoomed to failure. I do not say that the world is not, in certain particulars, becoming a somewhat better place to live in. This may, conceivably, go on for many generations, each one priding itself on some infinitesimal gain in the cosmic march to an unseen end. But in the meantime other forces are at work, vigorous, forceful, jealous, acquisitive, destructive. They are not going to wait for the slow gains to be achieved. They have brought about a catastrophe so gigantic that the mind of man fails to grasp its magnitude. Another will follow, and yet another, if humanity can rise at all from the wreck of its hopes. This is certain to happen unless we begin at a new point and try a new way. "The saving of society by a sort of Christian Fabianism and adulteration of the leaven must, one thinks, be regarded as a failure. Would it not be nearer the truth to change the figure a little and say that the Church has inoculated the world with a mild form of Christianity and made it proof against the real thing?"*

But I have said that this method is foredoomed to failure. By that I do not imply, that if the forces of evil would wait long enough we might reach the goal by this way. I simply mean that we should never reach the goal at all by this means. Making other people do the thing we think is good for them has no moral value for either party and cannot create a family.

* *The Kingship of God*, by G. B. Robson, in this series, p. 164.

The dynamic power of the experiment is patent to everyone who has studied the history of scientific research. *It creates belief in the thing it demonstrates.* The experiment that demonstrates the practicability of the love of God and its power to solve human problems in smaller and larger ways cannot fail to create that belief in God without which all our dreaming is doomed to failure.

Nor do we need to be afraid to fail. A thousand failures may mark the path to the epoch-making discovery. Failure intelligently observed may demonstrate a deeper truth than success. This is where the Christian Revolutionary group has the advantage of any highly-organised and property-possessing body. Prudence becomes a virtue in the latter. The former can appreciate the lines of Lascelles Abercrombie in *The Sale of St. Thomas*

Prudence is the deadly sin
And one that grows deep into a life,
With hardening roots that clutch about the breast.
For this refuses faith in the unknown powers
Within man's nature, shrewdly bringeth all
Their inspiration of strange eagerness
To a judgment brought by safe experience ;
Narrow desire into the scope of thought.

VI

If I rightly understand the Way of Jesus it was for Him a way of association, infection and experiment. He needed a group of friends with whom and through whom to work.* He simply could not and cannot carry on His work in the world without such association, and His great concern was to create out of these heterogeneous elements a band united with a great purpose in loyalty to Him and to one another. He left behind Him a Christian Revolutionary group of the most vital and daring kind ; and the things that

* See *The Galilean*, by N. Micklem, Chapter III, "Jesus as Friend."

impressed their enemies above all else were their boldness and their mutual love. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples if ye have love one to another."* "When they beheld the boldness of Peter and John . . . they marvelled."† "See how these Christians love one another," was spoken first not in irony, but with admiration.

And Jesus trusted to the power of infection. He sent His disciples forth as sheep in the midst of wolves, as salt in the earth, as lights in the world, as witnesses of Him, simply to spread the infection of that terrific belief in God, that simple devotion to Him that did, by this means "turn the world upside down." The radiating point in all the world's history from which the light shines farthest and purest is the cross of Christ which owes its virtue not to any power to compel or dominate men but simply to the infective principle of forgiving love.

Was this not then the great experiment, more moving and convincing than any amount of arguing and preaching? He was not afraid to fail. Unless He risked failure it were impossible to demonstrate the absolute worth of love. The "power of the resurrection" is the starting point of the Christian revolution. It is the plain fact that is written on all subsequent history that His death was no failure. The experiment succeeded, not in delivering Jesus from death, that was not its object, but in liberating a new redemptive force in the world which has not ceased to work even now.‡

This, then, is the last thing I have to say about the Way of the Christian Revolution—it liberates the omnipotence of God which is nothing else than the omnipotence of Love.§ This way is effective not simply because it can be shown to be the one and only

* John xiii. 25.

† Acts iv. 13.

‡ Cf. *The Galilean*, Chapter IV, "The Great Offensive."

§ See *The Christian Ideal*, p. 229.

way by which human society can be changed into the divine human family it is meant to be. It is effective, because, and perhaps this is really saying the same thing, it is the channel through which the life of God can flow into human society. Loving human personalities linked in friendship, spending themselves on others, united in creative enterprises—there is no other way by which God can so fully enter and possess His world.

CHAPTER IV
FALSE STARTS

“ Jesus did not deal with systems but with persons, and for the very good reason that systems are simply organised personal relationships ; change the relationship and the system is destroyed. Under the Roman Empire the system of the collecting of the Imperial Revenue put a premium upon extortion. Jesus, so far as we know, never said a word against the system ; he did not appeal to the Emperor to change it (politics) ; he did not appeal to the Zealots (violence) ; he believed in direct action ; so he appealed direct to Zacchæus. At last Zacchæus had met someone who, for all his patriotic feeling about the Roman oppression, for all his horror of extortion, yet did not denounce him nor even scorn him, but manifestly loved him, believed in his better nature, and on the strength of that faith was prepared to come and dine with him and treat him as a brother, even though he hated his business and had seen no fruit of repentance in him. Jesus won Zacchæus, and the whole neighbourhood began to feel the difference at once. In comparison with the way of Jesus the way of the violent and the politician are alike slow and indirect and ineffective, or rather they produce an altogether different result.

N. MICKLEM.

CHAPTER IV

FALSE STARTS

I

WE are still left without an answer to the question as to how the Christian ideal for society is to be applied and worked out, gradually it may be, in a community many of whose members have not as yet come into the family spirit. This problem raises the whole question of the relation of Church and State, and has been dealt with fully in one of the volumes of this series.* Certain aspects of the question cannot, however, be passed by in this book, and I propose to begin by showing why some methods that have been and are being used are fatally defective, and so to lead up to the answer to the problem stated above.

In the first place I wish to associate myself very strongly with those who hold that we have got a quite exaggerated sense of the importance of the State in human society. The State organisation is only one way by which men and women are bound together and because it is given so large an authority over the lives of the citizens and can call upon them to so great an extent for service, taxes, and obedience it is looked upon by many as almost the only really important form of association. Whether we will or no, if we are born in a certain place we become citizens of a certain State. It records our birth, it dominates our growing years with its educational system, it regulates our adult life, our business or profession, and the holding of our property, it presides at our marriage and registers our death. Until recently this "leviathan" has so dominated most of our social thinking that men can scarcely think

* *Christ and Cæsar*, by Herbert Morgan and the Editor.

of social progress save in terms of state action. It has, however, become clear now that the deeper life of society is far less dependent on state action or inaction than might at first appear. How much more of a man's life, for example, is made up of his extra-state activities than of anything that can be regarded as directly state controlled. In the process of earning his living, he will very likely relate himself to his fellows in trade union, or co-operative society, or employers' federation; or he will join with others in creating the informal society of those who labour together or exchange goods or are related as doctors, nurses and patients in a hospital or as pupils and teachers in a school. In addition to such vocational associations there are the many voluntary associations which absorb far the larger part of the life-interest of numbers. The club, the scientific society, the church, the social circle to which we belong—these are the groups that register the temperature, as it were, of our social organism, far more accurately than State organisation.

When, therefore, we think of social progress we need to remember these avenues of approach to the problem, and in these places it is clear that the method of the Christian revolution can at once be applied. The element of coercion is reduced to a minimum in these bodies, and it is usually a fairly easy thing to drop out of the group if its activities are not in accordance with one's principles. Through these voluntary groupings the individual has a much larger chance of making his influence felt than in the State organisation. There is much less danger of domination by a governing caste. Some of these societies are even capable of being naturally transformed into the very type of group we were considering in the previous chapter.

To one who has come to think as I have on Christ's method for social regeneration, it is a very significant thing that so much of the best thinking on social questions is turning toward the extra-state life of man with new hope for the future. It seems to be a

confirmation, from an unexpected quarter, of the political sagacity, if one might use such a phrase, of Jesus Christ. The creative powers of just such groups as He thought of, or actually formed, seem to be recognised to-day by very many who have not consciously drawn their inspiration from Him.

“But, granted all this,” someone will say, “how are we to get these creative ideas adopted into the structure of society? Surely we must at some point, exercise coercion over a recalcitrant minority. Or in some cases we must, if necessary by violent means, destroy a system that has proved not only useless but even harmful or that, having served a useful purpose, has outlived it and now blocks our onward path.” So men turn to the political method on the one hand, or on the other to the way of violent revolution, if the former seems too slow and torturous. These methods we must examine in relation to the dream of Jesus before we attempt to answer the problem constructively.

II

The Political Method.

It is not easy to distinguish in one's mind between politics, as they now are in the countries we may be most familiar with, and the political method as it might become if used in a more Christian society. Nor is it, for our purpose, very necessary wholly to do so. For we are concerned not with a problem of what we might do if things were other than they are, but with what we are to do now in order to make them different. I shall have something to say later about a Christian political method. Now I am anxious to study the actual political machinery that we know and to form some conclusion as to the value of such machinery for reaching the end we have set before ourselves.

Let me begin by quoting one of the noblest of living statesmen, Lord Morley, who says: “The political spirit is incessantly thinking of present consequences

and the immediately feasible. . . . It is the great force in throwing love of truth and accurate reasoning into a secondary place."* To get into the political arena, to enter, for example, the lobby of the House of Commons, is to begin at once to think in terms of expediency rather than in terms of ultimate right and wrong. How seldom is any political issue related, in the minds of politicians, to fundamental principle in such a way that whatever argument may be used, the principle is maintained inviolate. Yet it is, above all, this spirit that the Christian revolution needs. Again, is there any political system that has not resulted in a concentration of power in the hands of the few? Is any so-called democracy in the world free of this fault? This is one of the chief causes of revolution. In words written years ago that now sound almost prophetic, Rudolf Sohm has pictured the society we know :

"It is like the earth on which we live. A thin crust around a great volcanic, seething revolutionary heart of liquid fire. Outwardly all is flourishing, and thriving in peace and order ; but another moment, and the Titanic elementary forces of the underworld have changed all this splendour into dust and ashes. There are only a few who form society, society that possesses, rules, enjoys and takes a part in public life ; the masses bear the burdens of life, and at the same time represent the all-powerful enemy of society. So it has been in all ages. Society is wont to cherish the delusion that it constitutes the people, and that its interests are identical with those of the people ; until some revolution shakes the earth beneath its feet, and shows it that it was not the people, but only the thin crust around the fiery, seething heart."†

Whatever our political theory, politics in practice work out at a continuous attempt to impose upon the whole community the ideals and ideas of a comparatively small section. The dream of Jesus is not brought about

* On Compromise, pp. 111 and 136.

† *Outlines of Church History*, pp. 243-4.

by forces that work from above downwards, but by those that work from below upwards, or rather from within the heart of society to the outer circle where action is taken.

Just because of these elements of weakness it is found that the political method usually fails in evoking any great altruistic enthusiasm. It cannot appeal to what Mr. Kidd calls the "Emotion of the ideal," because it has to be content with half-measures, with the adjustments and compromises that seem inevitable in a world like ours. It is just here that the more revolutionary spirits have their chance, and it is a notable fact that the greatest enthusiasm aroused by political leaders comes when there is a fight over some great issue, either a party, an international, or even an inter-class one. Human fellowship and the method of discussion are the strongest elements in the political ideal of progress and link it most closely to the method of the Christian revolution. But it is when fellowship is broken and discussion abandoned that the strongest appeal is made to the latent idealism in men without which the great constructive tasks before humanity can never be achieved.*

To just those persons who are most deeply possessed with a social passion politics seem slow, intolerably slow, in a world that hastens on toward the city of destruction. This impatience is very natural; it is the expression of a hope long deferred that refuses to be denied; it is the breeding ground of revolution. For

* This paragraph raises a question as to how far the "emotion of the ideal" can be enlisted on behalf of constructive and peaceful ideas, and therefore how far it is a good thing to arouse it at all. Often the emotion carries men far away from the original ideal, and in so far as it was used in the instances quoted by Kidd (Japan and Germany) there was something essentially divisive in the aim. Our task is to use this latent force for uniting the family. The danger is lest it become the enthusiasm for a cause which leads to the overlooking of personal values. That this has very often happened in revolutions, wars and other movements does not necessarily condemn the whole idea. Surely there is a force here which is needed in human progress.

when we look more deeply at the political method in its essence, we are bound to confess that it must, from its own postulates, move forward only so fast as the "average mind" is ready to go. Its legislation is for men as they are, or seem to the politician to be, rather than for men as they may become, or seem to the Christ-eyes to be. For this reason politics always leaves a sense of unfulfilled hopes. The revolutionary spirit goes reluctantly into the political arena, and either feels stifled and quits it, or else becomes in course of time, a compromising, diplomatic, hair-splitting schemer. Let me hasten to add that I do not wish to say that everyone who goes into politics loses his soul. But I do say that the Christian Revolutionary spirit can scarcely, if at all, be maintained in the climate of modern politics

III

Violent Revolution.

From politics many of the more ardent spirits turn away with disgust and despair. They find their hopes being disappointed, their ideals being whittled away, their enthusiasm evaporating. History might seem to show that there are times when constitutional methods simply cannot achieve the end, when abuses cluster so thick upon the ground that only some heroic action that suddenly challenges and destroys them holds any promise of advance. Could the world have learnt the lessons of fraternity and liberty without the French Revolution? Could England have rid herself of the tyranny of a false idea of monarchy without Cromwell? Could even the liberation of the slave have been accomplished with anything less than a civil war? May it not be that Bolshevism, even with all its mistakes and terrors, is accomplishing some great and good end in the destroying of our pathetic faith in capitalism? These questions do not admit of a ready answer, and I am not able to deal with them historically here. But I do suggest that in each case, the more deeply we look

beneath the surface, the more doubtful we become of the assumption that the methods used were the best, or that the results have really been as good as they might have been if some other method had been chosen.

I am not, however, disposed to estimate lightly the value of the revolutionary method (*i.e.*, the method of violent revolution). Not only does it sometimes seem to be absolutely necessary, forced upon the progressive by the immovable conservatism of a dominant class, but it has the positive advantage of calling out the latent idealism and heroism of men and quickening them to undertake great tasks for which, at ordinary times, they seem inadequate ; it has the merit of acting quickly in the destruction of obsolete institutions, and so it clears the air and clears our thinking ; it forces men back through subterfuge and sophistry to stern reality.

Nevertheless there are certain fatal defects in violent revolutions. It is scarcely necessary here to do more than enumerate some of the chief of these. Revolutions tend to be destructive rather than constructive, passion gets the better of reason in the fierceness of the conflict, many things that are good go with those that are outworn, historical continuity is broken and much patient rebuilding is required, bitterness is left and often the immediate success of the new idea is followed by serious reaction ; this may be due to the actual excess and intolerance of the leaders or to the fact that they are simply trying, as it were, to jump a stage in human development, and the world is not ready to be forced forward at such a pace. Revolution tends to foster the illusion that physical force is essential for human progress and so may lead to a glorification of force, as witness the Napoleonic régime and the present parlous state of China following her revolution.

While there is no need to labour these points, we must make up our mind that this method is not one which can produce the thing we have aimed to secure. It breaks human fellowship and it relies upon coercion

which, as we have seen, can never produce a family spirit. Many are doubtless infected by the revolutionary spirit and catch the enthusiasm of a great hope. But that hope, being one which men seek to realise through force, cannot be identical with the Christian's hope for society, and in fact the inevitable tendency of a revolutionary party is to concentrate on the outward conditions of a good social order rather than on the inward ones which are ultimately decisive.

The latest large-scale experiment in revolution illustrates these points very clearly. The leaders of the Bolshevik revolution represent the class-conscious section of the proletariat, and have tried to force the minority's will upon a reluctant majority. They are being forced into a position of industrial autocracy, largely at the beginning by the Allied blockade, much as the antagonism of Europe hastened the process of reaction to militarism in post-revolution France. Class-hatred has become a religion, and no religion of hatred has the germs of redemptive life. There seems little prospect that this type of revolution will be creative of a true communism, still less of a real family life.*

But the social revolutionary will be impatient with the foregoing argument, not because he disputes its validity as a theoretic discussion of a problem in sociology, but chiefly because it seems to him to rest upon a fundamental blindness to the facts of the present situation. Let me take the view put forward by R. W. Postgate, in *The Bolshevik Theory*, as typical of the more moderate statement of the case. He says that "the true-blue pacifist will have nothing to do with the class war; for him it either does not exist except perhaps as a certain regrettable snappiness which could easily be remedied, or else, as far as it does exist, should and could be removed by a Change of Heart only." He further points out that any idea of a pacifist general strike by industrial action only would inevitably

* Cf. *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*, by Bertrand Russell. Especially Chapter vi.

lead to actual civil war. His contention on this point seems to me irrefutable in society as it now is.* What he has not seen is that there is another method that does not even invoke the general strike. He may regard this method as wildly idealistic, but it springs not from blindness to the facts, but from an even deeper diagnosis of their significance. The social revolutionary sees two classes ranged upon two sides of a conflict, each animated by his self-interest or class-interest. The proletariat stands, in idea, for the good of the community as a whole, but it is at present only a section of that community, and it must exercise its power in order first to reduce the other section to impotence and secondly to bring that section into line with the proletariat so that there is no longer any class distinction. To move towards this end is to call forth the inevitable opposition of the possessing class which is certain sooner or later to reply with violence, since it at present possesses, in nearly all countries, the power so to act. It is obvious to those who think in this way that this class interest can only be overthrown by the exhibition of superior force.

But suppose this to be a false psychology. Suppose that this fundamental antagonism could be resolved by an appeal to the possessors that would prove to be irresistible, not because it was backed by economic or armed force, but because it was so charged with the spirit of Jesus Christ. Is it not clear that if such an appeal could be made and did succeed, the solution would be on the basis not only of a larger righteousness but on that of an essential goodwill which could overcome all kinds of minor difficulties? Because I see such a possibility for human society I turn away, even when most restive at the tedious and tortuous way of politics, from the alluring method of violent revolution.

* *Op. Cit.*, p. 119; see the whole of Chapter x. on "Industrial Pacifism."

IV

Coercion.

Before answering the question with which I began this chapter, I want to deal with the problem of coercion at somewhat greater length, both because it bears on what has been said in the two previous sections, and also because there still remains the awkward question: "Is there no place for coercion in restraining the evil-doer, even if it cannot be creative of a new order?" Many people who will agree as to the powerlessness of compulsion as a means of ultimately solving the social problem maintain its value as a means of what might be called "keeping the ring," or, at least, see no way by which the argument of those who would introduce it for this purpose can be resisted. The argument, once admitted, seems to many to carry us straight on to a support of defensive war, and in particular to the justification of the late war on what may be called the "mad-dog theory" of Germany. For a fuller discussion of the problem I must again refer the reader to *Christ and Cæsar*.*

We may begin by the statement of certain propositions about coercion, from which it will be seen that I do not adopt the Tolstoyan position on this vexed question. While that position has the merits of presenting a logical case easy to understand and apply, it does not seem to me to be true to life. I grant that it is very much harder, when once you have admitted the justification of the use of force at any point, to know where to draw the line. But life is full of just this kind of difficulty, and it may well be argued that human personalities can only be developed by facing such difficulties, and not by running away from them into a logical strong-hold that saves any further thinking.

The absurdity of the supposed logical difficulty in admitting "the use of force" at all is made apparent by an analogy. The use of opium in China is a terrible evil and I, along with many others, feel gravely concerned

* See especially pp. 225ff.

to help China to rid herself of this curse. Nevertheless, at a certain critical moment I saved my wife's life by the use of opium. Am I, because I so acted, prevented from raising my voice against the opium traffic with China? Here at any rate the absurdity of the contention is obvious, and the fallacy lies in the difference between the destructive, self-gratifying use of the drug, and the curative, other-regarding use of it.

The following propositions seem to me to have some value in guiding our thought on this perplexity. They assume the point of view I have been presenting in the previous chapters. After I have stated them I shall have something to say about the use of coercion by a group that does not accept that point of view.

1. *Coercion can be used when the coerced consent.* This covers cases where the persons are associated in a society with certain specified rules, each person who joins agreeing to accept a certain penalty if he infringes them. In theory it covers the case of a democracy where men by voting, agree to accept the will of the majority whether they happen to belong to it or not. In point of fact this is so little recognised that it can be fairly urged that all democracies rest in the last resort, upon the power of the majority to coerce the minority.*

2. *Coercion can be used by a really impartial body concerned to redeem the offender.* This may be illustrated by a father intervening in a quarrel between his sons. It may be assumed that he loves both equally, and that his object is not to vindicate some abstract idea of right, but to bring his child to a right mind. Whether, in any particular case, he should or should not use force is quite another matter.

3. *Coercion can be used in ways that affect property and privilege, but not in ways that injure the person.* A community that was suffering through the perpetual misuse of his property by one of its members might, in my view, so act as to deprive him of his rights in that

* See the treatment of this question in *Christ and Cæsar*, pp. 234-6.

property. What it would do if he forcibly resisted is a matter for further consideration.

4. *Coercion must not be used for an end unrelated to the redemption of the person coerced.* In the case just cited coercion might be a means of bringing a man to realise his own misdeeds. If, however, the community goes to the length of executing the death penalty it gives up its chance of bringing the man to his "right mind." The death penalty is, in my view, inadmissible in all circumstances, because its purpose is to deter others, or is entirely retributive, and it cannot come under the idea of the redemptive use of force.

5. *Coercion must not be used in a way which prevents the appeal to a man's better nature.* This principle, is of course, very difficult to apply, because it allows for the great differences between persons. In a family one child may be helped and even won to a larger affection towards his parents by a method of punishment that may alienate and embitter another.

6. *Coercion must not be used by a party to a quarrel.* This principle gives one clue to the difference between a police force and an army, although by no means the only one, as, if taken alone, it would seem to justify an international army, which, from the point of view of the Christian revolutionary, I cannot myself admit. The two previous points are also significant in this connection.

7. *The coercing body must be subject to public criticism and act in the open.* In view of the very grave dangers of coercion both to the body politic and to the persons who, on its behalf, may exercise the function, this would seem to be an absolutely essential condition. History is full of examples of the abuse of power given to a body that could act secretly and whose judgments were not open to review.

8. *The aim of all coercive measures must be to do away with the need for coercion.* The tendency of coercion is to feed upon itself and to extend its sway. In a community that uses coercion at all it is important that

this power, limited as suggested, and it may be in other ways, should be entrusted only to those who are most reluctant to use it, who will exhaust every other method known to them before doing so. This would help to carry out the aim here suggested.

I do not suppose that this brief statement exhausts the topic, but it may clear the way for what I specially wish to say at this point. In the first place let it be clear that no abstract principles can guide our action unerringly. All cases are more than mathematical problems. Not only in applying the fifth principle but in some measure in all, we are concerned with an extremely complex problem in which several personalities are concerned. The only sure guidance is the deeper knowledge of the particular persons which may come through spiritual illumination. If all life should be and may be related to our Father's will, we can count upon this illumination, and it may frequently be given in ways that will surprise us and make it possible to eliminate the use of force even where it had seemed to us the only possible way of handling the situation.

I almost hesitate to give the following incident, because it seems as if it had been invented to illustrate the point. I heard the story a few years ago and can vouch for its accuracy. A certain man had recently been converted in a Salvation Army meeting. Going home one night he found his father intoxicated and actually attacking his mother with a hatchet. He went up to his father and said to him quietly, "You know you oughtn't to do that, Dad." His father put down the weapon, sobered by his son's words and spirit, and the incident led to a change in the man's own life. Here is a case where the use of force would seem, on general principles, to be justifiable, and indeed the only means of dealing with a desperate situation. A man enters the room, who has recently come into a new and vital experience of God in his own soul. Responding, as I hold, to that inner guidance which transcends all formulæ, he deals with the situation in what we should

be tempted to call an absurd way. And, be it noted, he not only defends the defenceless woman, but he avoids the danger of still further infuriating a drunken man, and perhaps doing him serious harm, and also is the means of permanently solving the problem. His act creates out of the violent drunkard a good husband. How many of our so-called insoluble problems could be handled in a similar way I have no means of knowing ; but it is clear that, given a real interest in the offender and a passionate desire to change his evil mind into a right one, there are many situations that could be dealt with quietly which seen, on the face of it, to demand what we should call more vigorous methods. The fact is that the resort to force in most cases implies a disbelief in God and in man, it is a surrender of the higher method for the sake of a lower, easier, and, be it noted, a less ultimately effective way of meeting evil.

I remember discussing a similar problem with a friend during the recent war, and he said to me, " Yes, I should wish to use all the spiritual force which I could command, but I should like to have a revolver in my pocket to use if the worst came to the worst." Now the view of the place of coercion that I am here maintaining is emphatically not that of my friend. It is not a case of turning to coercion as a last resort, but using it, if at all, as part of the method of love. The " last resort " in the mind of Jesus seems to have been the supreme appeal of forgiving love. If that failed, nothing else would succeed, for the end He had in view. If we have a revolver in our pocket, so to speak, we just miss the power to make the final appeal of good will.

It is frequently urged that Jesus' act in driving the traders from the temple-court is a justification of the " use of force " and even of war. It seems to me an excellent illustration of the thing I am pleading for. In the first place one may note that a careful reading of the Greek makes it clear that the scourge of cords was used for the beasts and not for the men (note the R.V. translation of John ii. 15, the only Gospel that mentions

the scourge is the only one that mentions the cattle). But even were it not so, of what value could such an instrument have been had Jesus been relying upon physical force to deal with a number of men whose vested interests were at stake? What was it that made those men yield to Him? Clearly no whip, but the moral authority of one who knew He was in the right—in fact, not physical but spiritual force. There are many cases where if we rely upon physical force it is perfectly certain we shall be overcome, as indeed would have been the case in this instance. There is no case where it is a foregone conclusion that love and patience will not be able to meet the danger.*

But after all we must come back to the deeper thought that the prevention of a man from doing evil is not the great Christian aim, and there may be many occasions where evil may have to be permitted and even, it seems, encouraged (as when one turns the other cheek) in order to overcome it and not simply stop it. As Milton puts it: "God sure esteems the growth and completing of one virtuous person more than the restraint of ten vicious."

We may say, then, that the "keeping of the ring" is not necessarily a Christian duty, and that it may be a truer way of solving the problem to leap into the ring like Telemachus and die there. For a country that "stands for the right" in an international conflict to be defeated may not be a disaster for the purpose of God. It may be a greater disaster that a given country, in a just cause, should use an unjust method. The Christian sees in the utter defeat of Judah and the deportation of her people by a ruthless military power the working out of a deeper purpose for humanity. For this nation, suffering one might almost say, unjustly, because the fit medium, through such suffering, for the coming of the world's Redeemer; having learnt a monotheism that was universal in its outreach, and having seen something

* See *The Arm of God* referred to above for fifty examples of this fact.

of the mystery of vicarious suffering.* Is it so certain, even to those who believe most that the Allies fought in a just cause, that their victory, as evidenced in the Treaty of Versailles, is a mark of the progress of righteousness in the world?

The Christian revolutionary will not then be driven by specious arguments into a destructive use of force that is mere restraint of evil. He will not be misled by the idea that the outward victory of a "just cause" is identical with the triumph of love and goodness. He will see that the larger ends demand a larger patience, and a greater confidence that God is working in the hearts of all and that His love cannot be finally overthrown. Where He does use physical force it will be as a part of the all-inclusive aim of creating a family in all the world. His reading of history will show him that the martyr has generally been more successful in this endeavour than even the most devoted soldier. He will see in Raymond Lull, going out weaponless and possessed with the passion of redeeming love into the Moslem world, an infinitely more potent force for securing the real ends of the Church of Christ than the tens of thousands who flocked under the banners of the Crusades. His way is clear. To turn from it is to leave the world without witness to the way of the Cross.

For be it noted that all right-thinking men oppose aggressive wars, or the use of force for selfish and evil ends. The distinctive thing about the way of Jesus is just this, that He saw that violence could not be used in a good cause and for the defence of the right. He saw that to allow your opponent to choose the weapons was simply to surrender the pass. And this applies just as much to the restraint of evil as to the active propagation of good. And, be it noted, the persistent pursuit of this way by any nation or group of nations,

* The fact that we read the story through the words of those who saw in the captivity a just judgment on Judah for her sin should not blind us to the fact that relative to her conqueror, she was in the right.

could not fail so to change the international atmosphere as to deal with the supposed "mad-dog" before he became a menace so threatening as to support the argument that only the violence of war could restrain him. Is there such a thing as a nation that could be led into and maintain a war against an unresisting foe which was acting towards it in persistent, self-forgetful good-will?

There still remains the question, what else can a community or individual do, if it be not prepared to take all the risks of the Christian way? The object of this book is not to give a treatise of ethics, and I am not prepared to say that a pagan or semi-pagan state, such as England, could, at its present moral stage, do anything else but arm, and if need be fight, when a public wrong has been committed. If we will not take the Sermon on the Mount as a guide for our relations to weaker races, for our industrial development, for our international politics, how can we suddenly isolate a single issue and choose to take the way of Christ in that? The pagan State may be "relatively justified" in acts which, for the Christian revolutionary, are utterly impossible. It is quite arguable that even for England as she was in 1914 another way than war could have been discovered had our statesmen there and then determined to seek divine light and to follow it at all costs.* But the argument I am pressing does not demand any such support. *The fact of belonging to a certain State is not the most significant one for a Christian.* He has seen a larger social end than that to which his State is committed, and his acts, if he be consistent, must always contribute towards the realisation of that end. So the Christian revolutionary becomes, in certain circumstances, a conscientious objector, seemingly taking his stand against society even in what is, for it, the highest and most self-sacrificing way of dealing with a concrete situation. In so acting he is neither condemning the

* This position is taken by A. Maude Royden in her well-known pamphlet *The Great Adventure*, published shortly after the outbreak of hostilities and well worth perusal again in the light of events.

State nor those in it who have chosen another path. But if he sees that they are making a false start, and that a better way would open to them if they dared to take it, his largest service to society is to stand for that.*

Some pacifists were on trial at the Mansion House for the issue of literature that was judged to be contrary to the interests of a warring State. The Public Prosecutor in a moment of inspired indignation said, with horror, "If all the world thought as you do, war would be impossible!" That sums up the contention of the Christian revolutionary. Not only to think, but also to act in such a way that if all others so thought and acted, war and the other great social evils would be impossible—is this or is it not the way of Christ?

Whatever may be said for Political or Revolutionary methods as ordinarily practised, they do not seem to me to be essentially creative. The acid test is, Can they create a family? Judged by this standard both fail. What is needed is the use of the one great creative force in the universe. That force is love. Find and use a method whereby love can be fully expressed and worked out in human affairs, and you are touching the springs of action, you are liberating the elemental forces of divine creative activity.

V

Let us come back, then, in the light of these considerations, to the question with which we started the chapter. Can we throw any light on the problem of the way by which a Christian social order can actually be established and embodied in the structure of society. It will be said that it is easy to see that there are many dangers in politics, especially as now known, that there are very grave dangers in violent revolution and that

* For a fuller statement of this position and especially the point about the "relative justification of the pagan State," see Dr. C. J. Cadoux's pamphlet, *An Appeal to the People of the Christian Church* (F.O.R., 17, Red Lion Sq., London).

coercion is clearly a most undesirable weapon. But what are we to do? Broadly speaking the Church has chosen to use the political method, has condemned violent revolution and has judged the value of coercive methods not on principle but in relation to the particular end to be achieved. Of course there are many exceptions, but this is at least the prevailing temper in our own day. Thus it happens that revolutionary spirits feel the Church to be out of touch with their deepest aspirations. Thus it happens that politicians regard the Church as a very useful asset when they wish to appeal for support in using violence. They seldom fail so to present a case as to give it the appearance of a great moral issue. The Church is therefore, impotent in great crises, and has no sure line of solution for our social distresses. If she could see and take the way of the Christian revolution, as was largely the case in the first three centuries of the Christian era, she would become a real force to be reckoned with in the world, but neither politician nor social revolutionary could "use" her.

We must leave to the next chapter the answer to the question I have propounded, but it will be worth while for us to summarise some of the outstanding points in the above discussion in order that we may the better make comparison with what follows.

1. Both politics and revolution (violent) rely to some extent upon coercion, and use this method beyond what is possible for the Christian revolutionary.
2. Revolution is too quick, going faster than the people can follow, and thus leads to excess and to reaction. Politics is too slow and cannot set the pace, leading to a sense of impatience in the more eager.
3. Revolution tends to clarify the issue by courageous thinking, but often obscures truth by passion. Politics provides a quieter atmosphere for discussion of truth, but tends to obscure it by party prejudice on the one hand and by compromise on the other.
4. Revolution awakens enthusiasm among its supporters but deepens the gulf between the different

sections. Politics, while preserving goodwill (as a rule), fails very often to call out the "emotion of the ideal" that is needed for reaching high ends.

5. Revolution is weak in its constructive side and breaks with the past even beyond what is necessary. Politics, while often stronger in constructive statesmanship, is too timid in tackling great abuses and so fails to destroy what is obsolete.
6. Revolution uses the conviction of the masses and so works from within outward in its early stages. Politics tends to become bureaucratic, working from above downwards.

I am well aware that this summary is defective and open to criticism, but it may be suggestive. I claim that the method of the Christian Revolution is not open to the objections here set forth, that it combines the good and eliminates the evil of both methods.

Jesus Christ believed that it was possible to create a new world order without appealing to violence, by enlisting the good in men on the side of progress, by calling upon this good to take sides with Him against the evil in ourselves and in the world, and thus by securing that full co-operation of God and men which is the first requisite if a better way of life is to be known and practised among men. This method of procedure does not force the pace so as to lead to excess, but it does call out all the enthusiasm of youth and the courageous perseverance of mature life in a supreme and hopeful effort. It proceeds, wherever possible, through fellowship, and it avoids the rancour of the party fight. It is fearless in probing wrong, but its main strength is put into constructive experiments. Its hope of success lies in the fact of the appeal to a man's true self, and in utilising the divine power. It is a way of faith, for all the appearances are against those who take it. It is a way of hope for it *is* possible in this way to reach the goal. It is, above all, the Way of love, for love is the one force in human affairs that never fails for, God is love.

CHAPTER V
CHANGING THE SYSTEM

“ As for me, my bed is made : I am against bigness and greatness in all their forms, and with the invisible molecular forces that work from individual to individual, stealing in through the crannies of the world like so many soft rootlets, or like the capillary oozing of water, and yet rending the hardest monuments of man’s pride, if you give them time. The bigger the unit you deal with, the hollower, the more brutal, the more mendacious is the life displayed, So I am against all the big organisations as such, national ones first and foremost ; against all big successes and big results ; and in favour of the eternal forces of truth which always work in the individual and immediately unsuccessful way—under-dogs always, till history comes, after they are long dead, and puts them on top.

WILLIAM JAMES

CHAPTER V

CHANGING THE SYSTEM

I

WE now come to what is perhaps the most difficult part of our subject. I will assume a certain agreement on the part of some at least of my readers who may be taken as saying—"No doubt the method you describe is the ideal method and should be used far more than it is, but is there no place for a Christian in politics or even under some circumstances in a social revolution? How can we make the transition from the way of life of your Christian revolutionary groups to the enactment of these ideas in society, unless some men of the type you speak of will come into politics and help to carry out the change? After all, the social system is established by law and maintained by force, and under this system many do not get the chance to develop their personalities. How are they to do so unless we do change the system, and how is the system to be changed if Christians stand out of politics? Are you not really pleading for the setting up of little separated communities which will become pharisaic in spirit and useless for social reform? Is it not better to associate ourselves with any movement, even if it be political, that is moving toward the same goal, even though it may not see all the way? Would you, for example, oppose the League of Nations because it is not wholly pacifist or fully democratic? Would you oppose the British Labour Party because it is still influenced by class-selfishness, even although its policy is, let us suppose, much more enlightened and moderate than that of any other party that has any hope of governing the country in the near future?"

These are problems we must face, and, for some minds, it is not quite enough to argue that association with groups that rely on methods we cannot use will not really advance the cause. Our theoretical discussion of the relation of means to end must issue in some more or less clear conception of the way in which the much needed social changes will actually be effected. I ought, of course, to make it still more clear that I do not wish to say that "no Christian can enter politics"; all I do say is that the Church, as such, if she is to do her distinctive work in the world, cannot be identified with the political machine as it now is, and that the Christian revolutionary will put his main strength into quite other ways of reaching his end. I cannot lay down any hard and fast rule about exercising the vote, or going, let us say, into local government. What I call for is a new concentration of thought and effort upon the working out of the way of the Christian revolution, a concentration which is likely to lead to results that will make such problems almost if not quite irrelevant. The Church exists to do something which, in her organised life, she is not seriously attempting to do, and yet there are enough Christians in the world to do it very effectively if she called them to the attempt. She is doing much that is admirable and may be said to "justify her existence." But if she became, as I believe she was intended to be, a Christian revolutionary group, or many such inter-related groups, it would not be long before the answer to our problem would be given.

I have no doubt that a Church fully dedicated to this adventure would discover many ways by which her influence could reach out to the re-shaping of society, ways entirely consistent with the spirit of Christ which she was seeking to manifest. Her chief task would certainly be to express *in her own life* the maximum demand of Christ upon her members. But she could never remain neutral where she saw evil. She would ever be on the watch for ways in which evil might be overcome by good. This would become the most

exciting enterprise in the world, leading to opposition and danger and high endeavour, such as would call for the finest qualities of mind and heart. The youth of all nations would rally to such a Church. Her very failures would but rouse a deeper devotion, because they would be the high failures of a supreme effort after good, not the petty successes of a Church that always stands shivering on the brink in times of crisis or when enemies are many.

That low man seeks a little thing to do,
 Sees it and does it :
 This high man with a great thing to pursue,
 Dies ere he knows it.

That low man goes on adding one to one,
 His hundred's soon hit :
 This high man, aiming at a million,
 Misses an unit.

That, has the world here—should he need the next,
 Let the world mind him !
 This, throws himself on God, and unperplexed
 Seeking shall find him.*

In some such spirit would the awakened Church rise from small successes to great failures.

II

But its actual means for creating a new system can at least be suggested, and I should not be writing this volume did I not believe that, through many such failures it may be, the Church that tried the way of the Christian Revolution whole-heartedly would be actually creating a new social order. I can specify the following ways by which its activities would be "carried over" into the re-making of the social order in accordance with the creative dream of Jesus Christ, leaving others to be developed as the method is practised.

* Browning, *A Grammarian's Funeral*.

1. *The Creation of Public Opinion.* It is always open to the Christian revolutionary to present a case for any reform that he sees to be desirable, and to do his utmost to bring all citizens to see the desirability of it. Suppose we take a case like disarmament. The policy can be argued from economic, common sense and humanitarian points of view, and I see no reason why all these arguments should not be used in addition to that which would, for the Christian revolutionary, be the supreme one. Public opinion may be created in a way that will lead to heroic action, even before the whole community has seen or accepted the full Christian position. It would remain with the community to carry out the conviction which had been formed in whatever way it thought best. Its advance toward the Christian ideal of society is a definite gain, and it must be remembered that, if we are right in the belief that the Christian order of society is the only one that has the elements of permanence, it will be a distinct gain to society to take any step towards that order. It does not follow that all steps we might see, could be convincingly set before a public that does not accept the Christian principle of service rather than gain. But there will be some response because these ideals are fundamentally reasonable, and men everywhere have something in them that responds to a right and reasonable ideal.

2. *Direct appeal to the responsible agents of any policy.* This may sometimes seem to be an unjustifiable compromise, as in the case of the appeal to a government that is following a fundamentally wrong policy, to modify that policy in one small particular only. But we may take a more simple case, such as the direct appeal to a slum landlord or to a shareholder or a capitalist whose business is paying sweated wages. Where we are out to alter the whole system it seems to some that it is impossible to take any steps toward the amelioration of the lot of those who suffer under the system. It seems to them like oiling the wheels of an

engine of death, or, to change the simile, giving a new lease of life to an organism that should be destroyed without delay. Without questioning that cases may arise where this argument is decisive, I think we need to be very careful how we use it, for our first concern is with persons, and pity must not be crushed down in us by mere theorising. The method of the Christian revolution, used by a group or Church aflame with social passion, would surely avail in many cases to change the mind of the person or persons concerned in carrying on the evil; and in any case, it is a far better way of dealing with the situation than that commonly used of fierce denunciation of persons or classes "behind their backs," or even to their faces, so alienating them rather than winning them into doing the highest thing they can. The fact is we often fail because we despair of success along these lines, and so we never even try them. John Woolman's method of going to the slave-owning Quakers and pleading with them one by one for Christ's sake to free their slaves, is an excellent example both of the method and of its possible fruitfulness.

3. *Stimulation by example of the desire for a new order.* It is as men see the possibilities of a better way of life that they begin to want it. Advice and argument only go a little way. Some twenty-five years ago there was slavery in the small island of Pemba off the east coast of Africa. In 1890 the island came into the hands of Great Britain as part of the Heligoland exchange. Local experts assured the government that it was an economic impossibility to abolish slavery. The Society of Friends sent out a deputation to enquire and examine into the facts. They recommended the purchase of an estate on which to grow cloves, the staple industry of the island. This course was followed, although there was strong opposition from the government of the island, and the estate was carried on from the first entirely by free labour. Its produce actually secured a higher price on the open market than that of any other estate. Largely as a result of this demonstration and the

presence in the island of some few people who were carrying out what they conceived to be the Christian ideal in this difficult situation, the system of slavery has now been brought to an end. Of course there was a strong sentiment at home among those who knew the facts, and other methods were being used; but without this action they would certainly have been far less effective. Yet those who made the experiment had no part in the government of the island.

4. *Clarifying the issue with regard to special problems.* Very often what is wrong with an institution is rather felt than seen. Men have a dim idea that it ought to be changed but they do not see exactly why, nor just what to put in its place. The Christian revolutionary group should be a factor in meeting such difficulties. For example, we want to see clearly what is wrong with the competitive system, and what can be put in its place. The Church should enlist the best thought and the most dedicated spirits to study such a problem. Many men would be ready to work for a reform if they could have the issues defined for them. Such a task needs to be performed in regard to war, in regard to the problem of private ownership of property, in regard to the penal system and many other big public questions. It also needs to be performed in regard to many specific issues arising in industrial or international disputes or in other ways. If the spirit of God is available to help men who sincerely seek to know the truth, a Christian revolutionary group ought to be able to help greatly in many concrete situations that arise. I have had several experiences that show me how this has actually been tried out with manifest success.

5. *Causing an evil system to be abandoned because there are too few to work it.* When the process of infecting the body politic has reached a certain stage it is clear that the evil attacked must fall down by its own dead weight. Let us take the case of an army that is being used, as many are in China to-day, to bolster up the petty jealousy of a military chief, or to

support some form of autocracy. The method of the Christian revolution applied here, would be so to impregnate the soldiers with a new spirit that when called upon to fight they would not respond. Five hundred years ago an English king could easily enlist an army to fight an aggressive war against France and seek to secure some of her territory. Such a call to-day could not succeed, for Englishmen could not be found ready to fight in such a cause. These may not be very good examples, because the Christian revolutionary would seek to get the men to give up the whole method of warfare. But they may serve to show how impossible it is to carry on a system unless you have men who either care to maintain it or are too indifferent to seek for another. Any system is, after all, only the working out of the wills of individuals, although it is often an unconscious expression of their personalities, and in many cases the system is continued long after any active desire for it, on a large scale, has ceased. But in the end some means of consent must be desiderated for any system, and the method that works by consent must in the end prevail. Even forcible repression of revolutionary spirits may only serve to increase the movement. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church."

6. *The assumption of special responsibilities as called upon.* Where a Christian revolutionary group, or even person, has advocated a certain policy, and where other methods have been seen to fail, it is always possible that he may be asked to carry out his plan even by those who are not entirely of his way of thinking. I know a case where three men of this type went into a strike area and began by serving the strikers in the humblest way. They lost no suitable opportunity of using their influence against violence, and were able to prevent any being used by the strikers even when there was great provocation. In the end they became the representatives of the men, and were able to bring about a settlement that gained the

essential points and left good will on all hands. I know another case of such a man who went to a Trade Union meeting, where he was a stranger, was permitted to give his message of reconciliation, and was there and then sent round, as a representative of the central organisation to seek to bring, in their name, a new spirit into the whole dispute. Such cases would be many if the Church were a reconciling and a revolutionary force witnessing always to a higher way by which men might live at peace with God and their neighbours.

III

I regard the above as suggestions rather than as any final answer to our problem. The object of this book is to lead men to think rather than to supply an answer to every difficulty. But there is one thing more which remains to be said before we pass on to detailed applications and illustrations. The question will still be asked, "Is there no place where the Christian is himself to take hold of the control of affairs and try to shape the political organisation?" This raises the problem as to what would be the Christian political method if society were fully Christian. It is clear that a large body of persons living together need some form of organisation, however mobile, for their common life. They at least need some conventions on perfectly non-moral issues such as which side of the road to drive on. I can see no reason why Christian revolutionaries should not take part in the organisation of public life, but they would have to think out very clearly the principles, and the methods proper to those principles. Let me indicate some of the problems that seem to need further thought. What is to be the relation of a representative to those who elect him, in particular towards any group in the area (or industry if we have functional representation) who do not vote

for his election? How far is he to be a delegate appointed to do certain things, and how far a person whose character and insight and principles are trusted, free to act under various circumstances as he may think best? For example, a certain policy may be desirable and a representative may be committed to it in his election address; what liberty is he to have to withdraw his support if he feels that the way in which this good thing is being pursued is wrong? Can we expect to see a party that is organised on such principles as those here stated, and if so what relation would it have to existing parties? In discussing any policy what regard is to be paid to the views of the minority? Cannot some method of discussion of public affairs be discovered that would ensure progress by consent? An example in recent political history in Great Britain is the franchise legislation that arose from the Speaker's Conference during the War. Again, how are we to seek that divine guidance which is essential to our working out of the principles here stated, without degenerating into formality and insincerity, and with due regard to those who do not accept our premises?

It must be perfectly clear that the entrance of the Christian revolutionary into the present political system would be a matter of extreme difficulty on both sides. It would seem to me possible only as far-reaching changes were actually taking place in the electorate, but I am not prepared to say that it might not be possible for such changes to take place in the near future if the Christian revolutionary spirit should take hold of men's minds and hearts in a new and compelling way.

But the difficulty is really a far deeper one than the mere solution of such problems as I have indicated. The spirit of domination is one that it is peculiarly difficult to avoid if one gets into a position of government in a State. Even to go out to India as a missionary or trader is to become subtly infected by this spirit, because one belongs to the governing race and is

treated as a Sahib from the day one lands. To maintain the Christian spirit of service is a terrific task, even to the most humble-minded, in an atmosphere like that. The Christian revolutionary, charged with the duty of governing (or shall we use rather the word "directing" as the equivalent of the service he would wish to render) must be above all a servant and must retain this attitude not as a theoretical conception, but as a practical way of life.*

Furthermore, there is the problem of his relation to a country that does not fully accept his principles. "Can a man be a prime minister and a Christian?" was a question put to me by a certain Bishop at the close of a keen discussion of these things; and later he pressed the problem to a more personal issue with, "Can a man be a Bishop and a Christian?" Neither question admits of an easy answer, although one might at once answer that many men have been both. The real problem is whether the kind of official relationship to one's fellow-men that is almost inseparable from such positions is consistent with the spirit of One who washed His disciples' feet, and how far one can act for masses of one's fellow-men with perfect sincerity when they are not in the fullest relation of personal trust towards oneself. These official positions do tend to cut one off from the simple human relationships, and when we deal with large masses of men this seems inevitable. The responsibilities of the work are so great that one cannot be at the mercy of everyone, and so there comes to be a kind of wall around great men which is almost impassable to those who have not a certain "pull." Can we imagine Christ in such a place? If not, what is wrong? Are we attempting in our modern life to concentrate far too much in the hands of the few? Are we crowding on them functions that should be divided among many? Are we getting into such large social units that the Christian Spirit is simply starved

* Compare Chapter XI, on "The Demand for a Leader," in *Lay Religion*.

out? These are some questions that the revolutionary group must face.

But we have touched another question and that is the possibility of a Christian revolutionary relating himself at all in any permanent way to either a State or a Church that is not prepared to take the full way of Christ as he sees it. Here we have a State system that, as we have seen, is frankly founded on the acquisitive idea, that has not even begun in its corporate life to work out the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. I may illustrate this by the attitude even of the most progressive statesmen toward the question of German reparations. In an open letter to Sir Donald Maclean, Mr. Arnold Lupton has stated the point so well that I cannot do better than quote him. He says:—

“The exact words you used on March 10 (1921), as given in the official report, are as follows: ‘The substantially united determination of the nation that Germany should pay to the limit of her capacity . . .’ That seems to me a perfectly horrible statement to be made by any respectable person two and a half years after the war. For myself, I do not profess to be a Christian, because, since I began carefully to consider all that is implied by the profession of Christianity, I came to the conclusion that I was not prepared to make the necessary sacrifices which should be made by a professor of Christianity, but still I think some regard should be paid to the Christian ethics by members of the House of Commons, because every day they begin their labours with prayers in which reference is made to Jesus Christ as the great teacher. . . . Your statement that Germany must be made to pay to the limit of her capacity is not only not up to the level of the Christian teaching, but is diametrically opposed to it. Those Christians who pray at all pray in the following words: ‘Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us.’ Now, making Germany pay to the utmost is not forgiveness, it is the most terrible vengeance, and it is a vengeance

taken not upon the guilty, but upon the innocent. . . . I must say that, whilst I admire courage, I fail to admire the audacity which enables a man in your position to defy the teaching of Jesus Christ. . . . Does it not strike you that if not only England, but the other Allies, forgave Germany her debts, and if we restored to Germany her colonies in East and West Africa and in the Pacific, which we have stolen, that Germany then, without any compulsion, would gladly help to restore all the evil she has done in France and Belgium, and would cease to regard us with suspicion, fear and hatred, and that we might make a new Europe with a happier and nobler future than the past ? ”

I have given this extract because I think it serves to show up the extent to which the moral code we follow as a nation falls below the moral ideas of Jesus Christ. It is not simply that we miss the mark here and there, but that our fundamental assumptions in national policy are not Christian. We do not shape our policy, as a nation, to serve others at whatever cost, to forgive to the uttermost in spite of all appearances, to create an international brotherhood in which the interests of the whole shall be placed above those of any section. That Christian ideals have influenced national policy in this and other lands is a fact of real hopefulness. But it is sheer self-delusion to think that national policy is controlled by such principles. That being so, can a Christian revolutionary become a member of any government that might be formed ? Must he not stand in public life for a new way, and if he enters parliament at all, must it not be as he is called by a group who fully share his views and one prepared to take all the risks, in the national life, of the way of Jesus ? But even this does not mean that they can involve others who are not so prepared in taking those risks. The difficulty still remains. It must be solved not by a single thinker, but by an ever-growing body of those who will make it their first aim to work out the way of Jesus in relation to every problem.

IV

But I need not close on an unsolved problem that may only leave our thought confused. The task that we can clearly see lying before us is immeasurably great. A difficulty as to our line of action in a certain direction may simply be an indication of the call to concentrate all possible thought and effort in directions that are not debatable. I do not envisage a second Holy Roman Empire. In fact, I think the Church's apostasy dates just from that unholy alliance of Church and State. Ours is the task of building up little islands where humble service is rendered in the spirit of Christ, where the personality of each is really sacred, where we dare to risk all in order to bring love into every relationship. Every home where the true family spirit rules is such an island. Every business in which men live and work together in love and where they toil in order to serve their fellows rather than to enrich themselves is such an island. Every group where racial and national distinctions are swept away and men accept one another as brethren born to the same high destiny is such an island. Every fellowship where men of differing creeds worship together in joy, and strive together to build a new world is such an island. Every social circle where exclusiveness is excluded and where the sound of jealousy is stilled, where men and women find one another across the gulfs that are made by class and education and temperament is such an island. Every community that without arrogance is seeking to work out the relation of the Christian to his possessions, and that is staking all on some "holy experiment" in Christian living is such an island. In the midst of the ocean of misunderstanding and ill-will and greed the new continent is even now arising, and one day as the waters recede we shall discover that "God has chosen the things which the world regards as foolish, in order to put wise men to shame ; and God has chosen the things which the world regards as destitute of

influence, in order to put its powerful things to shame ; and the things which the world regards as base, and those which it sets utterly at nought—things that have no existence—God has chosen in order to reduce to nothing things that do exist.”*

There is something peculiarly impressive as we think of this process by which the new continent is yet to arise. Under the glamour of our state system, our great organisations, our vast wealth, our magnificent armies and navies, men are at times reduced to a state of almost helpless despair—until they lift their eyes again to God and see how all through history He has hidden His counsel from the wise and learned and revealed it to the simple-minded.† Still we see that every great forward move must be a people’s move, coming right out of the heart of men who face reality, who know the joy of labour and the power of love. “All the great religions have been spread upon People’s Movements ; all the signal struggles for liberty have been effected through People’s Movements ; peace in the world to-day, if attainable at all, will be attainable only through a united People’s Movement, bursting the bonds of caste and creed and submerging national prejudice.”‡

It may be in some way we have never dreamed of that the system will be changed. When men are deeply moved their actions cannot be calculated any more than you can calculate the course that the Yellow River will take when next it rises in one of its mighty floods. The comrades of the Christian Revolution will not be afraid though banks may burst. They will still go forward in fellowship, with courage, without violence.

* 1 Cor. i. 27-28 (Weymouth).

† Matt. xi. 25 (Moffatt).

‡ Louise H. Williams in *Hibbert Journal*, Vol. xix., p. 448.

PART II
APPLICATION

CHAPTER VI
THE HOME

“ The pilgrim soul is never alone on earth. The simplest relation, that of the family tie, underlies all our notions of social duty. The tribe is just an enlargement of the family idea. . . . A nation is a further extension of the idea of the family group ; and an empire as a combination of nations, is the largest extension of the idea we have yet reached.

“ If these are all essentially one idea, and if we can discover what the practice of Christianity is in the family relation, we shall discover also what it is in all these other and larger relations. If we can catch a glimpse of the vision that Jesus saw concerning this, which is the all-important matter for men on earth, we shall have gone very far toward reforming all our social tradition.”

LILY DOUGALL.

CHAPTER VI

THE HOME

IT now remains for me to illustrate the argument of the foregoing pages by showing in some detail how the method of the Christian Revolution can be applied in various spheres and how it is actually being applied in some specific cases of which I know. What I write must be regarded simply as suggestive and illustrative. It is fundamental to all that I write to recognise first that the fuller solutions of the problems of the corporate life are only to be found as we get together under divine guidance for the solving of them; secondly that the way of progress is through failure as well as through success, by the method that is of "trial and error"; and thirdly that no rigid rules can be laid down as to the detailed working out of the family spirit in hypothetical circumstances. For these reasons the importance of particular instances quoted does not lie in their success or in the precise way in which the problem has been handled. It is rather to be found in the example given of the application of a method. Nor should I wish to have the former part of this volume judged by the latter. What I have already said expresses, in the main, a deep and growing conviction in regard to the principles that must be discussed and applied in order to secure social health. What I have now to say is by way of a treatise on the practice of medicine in specific cases, a practice that is certain to be developed and improved as more people give their best thought to applying the principles. Let us then, in this spirit, consider together some of the many aspects of our common life that present opportunities for the working out of the spirit and method of the Christian Revolution.

I

In considering the creative dream of Jesus for human society I was at pains to urge that it was, in essence, a great family that He was thinking about. If this family idea is to be formative for the larger society it is of first importance that families of the right type should exist and be multiplied. Lecturing in China the other day, I was met by the not unnatural question, "What kind of a family are you thinking about, a patriarchal one with scores of persons gathered together under one roof, or a small family such as you have in England?" This, of course, raises the further question of the nature of the family bond, and the family spirit. The answer given in this case was that the nature of the father determined the spirit of the family, and this is clearly a fundamental consideration. An autocratic father will create a family entirely different from one created by persuasive love, and the thought of God which we get from Christ is regulative for all our family relationships. We can, however, go a good deal further than this and I propose to consider the home as the social unit, as the place where the Christian revolutionary idea can be most fully worked out and therefore as a creative and radiating centre for social progress. I am naturally thinking chiefly of the kind of home with which I am most familiar, the one-man-and-wife family, and one where the original contract is made by the free choice of both parties, not for them by their families and on economic and social grounds. I assume real sex-equality, where husband and wife enter the contract on the same terms, and an understanding that the relationship is a life-relationship. Before the close of the chapter we shall come back to these assumptions and examine their value or otherwise in regard to the fulfilment by the family of its true functions in society. In the meantime I shall attempt to state that function in terms of such a family life, not forgetting that there are many parts of the world where,

at present, these conditions cannot generally be fulfilled.

I have the very great advantage of coming from a home where the kind of life that I am pleading for has, to a very large extent, been lived. I have also been in, and intimate with, many other homes which exemplify the same thing. In reading such a chapter as Bertrand Russell's on "Marriage and the Population Question" in his *Principles of Social Reconstruction*,* I cannot escape the feeling that he would have written very differently had he had the background which I have had. He pictures the relations of man and woman in a family of the "traditional type," which are very different from those which I know, and it seems to me that the problem he states, and leaves unsolved, as to the way in which the transition can be made from such a type to one where there is perfect freedom, does not arise at all, for such homes as I am most familiar with, because true liberty has been found to be consistent with life-long monogamy. The problem he raises deserves, however, some further attention.† Here I am only pointing out the great advantage which comes from the fact of knowing intimately such families as are needed for the purposes we have in view.

II

The first consideration which marks out the home as creating the finest opportunity for the application of the principles of the Christian Revolution is the fact that it provides a sphere for the operation of love without external interference. Of course the State has something to say about the institution of marriage and the rearing of children, and the social circle has an influence of no small magnitude in setting up standards of conduct and taste which greatly affect the home.

* London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

† See below, Section V.

But these are relatively small factors in the inner working of the family life. Here there ought to be an intimacy and mutual regard, a joy in one another and sense of inter-dependence that form the basis of happy family life. When love is the law of the family it becomes clear that the ends of righteousness (just relations between persons) can only be secured as each member is inspired by the desire to deal rightly towards each other. Mere punishment, in the sense of retribution for wrong-doing ("he deserves to be punished for that"), or even in the sense of simply preventing disorder, gives way to a passion to bring the wayward child into the true family spirit, that is to say to make him feel that the aim of having a loving and orderly community is his aim. So there will be patience with and even acceptance of wrong-doing, if by such patience and acceptance the child can see for himself what disaster he is bringing in the family, that he is making harmony impossible. One reason, in my view, of the patience of the East is that in the large patriarchal family, where many must live in very close association the growing individual comes to recognise that it is far easier all round to "live and let live," and that there are quite obvious limits to personal whims and prejudices. This is possible even where there is little love, but where love is the most potent force in the family life the effect is far greater.

Such love is not mere indulgence. The idea that true affection expresses itself in allowing the child (in particular, an only child) to have everything he wants or cries enough for, is utterly contrary to the idea of love as I understand it. There is no true kindness in letting a child grow up so that he thinks he can get everything he wants, and then sending him out into the world to learn with tears and bitterness, the lesson that he must relate his wishes to those of others. In fact the home is just the place where that lesson can be learnt best, and where we can see that love imposes its own limitations on the loving spirit.

And this brings one to the difficult question of obedience. This virtue is at a discount in much modern writing, and still more in many modern families. There is a very natural reaction from the idea of obedience to an arbitrary will, the parental *fiat*, from which there could be no appeal. Many parents, having suffered from this, bring up their children with the aim of persuading them at each point and helping them to see the meaning and value of any direction given; or, even from very early years, the parents may wish their children to take a course only because they have themselves seen it to be best. For myself I can say that I am very thankful that I learnt obedience, and prompt obedience, in a home where it was very evident that the parental aim was the good of all the family, and where the spirit was such that obedience could be rendered gladly *even when one did not see what was involved in the order*. This has, I believe, made much easier for me the idea of a divine ordering of my life and a ready acceptance of what I knew to be right, even when it was far from pleasant.

The essential point seems to lie here. The child's knowledge and experience are limited; he lives with those who have a much wider and truer view of life, and who seek his good with their whole heart. The law of the home, if such a phrase can be used, is the highest good of all, which includes as we shall see shortly fitting the family to serve the community. The parent, in the earliest years, must, and even as the child reaches adolescence, may reasonably be expected to know better what is for the good of all than can any individual child. Obedience is the acceptance by the child of the highest good, as against his own will, even if the child cannot recognise that good at his present stage of development.

No doubt it is a very delicate question, as the child matures, to know how far to insist on what may be called blind obedience, and how far to reason and persuade. Probably the tendency of the parent is usually to be too

slow in introducing the latter method and thus to set up a spirit of revolt toward authority. But to err in the other direction will be to throw upon the young child a burden of choice and a consideration of problems for which he is not yet fitted, and may lead to premature seriousness, and other evils which many of us must have observed. The fact to be remembered is that we are dealing with a developing consciousness, and as each one must be studied as a separate person, no hard and fast lines can be laid down. The reason why the habit of obedience, learned in such a way, is a true help in mature life is surely that we are all of us as children maturing in a universe where we only "know in part," and that we ought to have the same attitude towards God, whose Fatherly heart is concerned for the good of His whole family, as the child should have towards a loving earthly parent. There are times when the will of God is not fully intelligible to us with our limitations, although His aim and method is to win our acceptance, and lead us to see for ourselves as right all that He sends us, or calls us to do.

It may be urged that the whole idea of obedience to a will which in the particular where obedience is claimed, cannot be made fully intelligible, is contrary to the conception of goodness for which I have been standing. But the relationship of loving trust, if fully maintained, makes such obedience of real moral value. When obedience is demanded from a resentful or rebellious child moral harm may be done, and still more easily where obedience is not so much to an intelligent command as to one which seems to the child to be contrary to his own instincts of right. The greatest respect must be paid to the tender developing conscience of the child. It is such considerations as these which lead us to emphasise ever and again the need of real love that operates through imagination and understanding. Love is the principle that must inspire the call for obedience no less than the tender forgiveness when wrong has been committed.

Is there no place for punishment and the use of force? Within the limits already stated, I find a place for a measure of coercion in the training of children. Used redemptively in order to help the child to understand, to take his right place in the family life and to learn the lessons of obedience, honour, truth and purity, I do not exclude even a measure of corporal punishment. But it seems to me essential that it should never be used in anger, that it should be used in no way that leaves a sense of injustice, and that it always should be inspired by so deep a love that the spirit of the father whose one concern is the child's good, shall clearly shine through the act. It would, of course, be far simpler to say that one must altogether eliminate this element in the family. But life is not so simple, neither is the training of any but the most angelic children! and these are not the kind that make the best material out of which to build a new world.

The family is a small community, a microcosm of the great world, and as the child comes to take his place in this little world, he learns an attitude towards almost all the great problems of life. What attitude shall he learn? In the homes we are thinking of he will learn to think very little of private property and personal rights. The child who is taught to emphasise the difference between mine and thine when as yet he can scarcely speak is being trained for an acquisitive society, not for a world family. He will learn that the joy of sharing is a far finer one than the joy of possessing and hoarding. He will learn to speak the truth even when it is likely to bring trouble. He will learn that all men are his brothers, not that certain classes, creeds or races are cut off from him by barriers it is not possible or wise to break down. He will be encouraged to be trustful, as he naturally is, rather than always to assume, as so many of his elders do, that one ought never to trust anyone until one has proved his trustworthiness to the hilt. He will find joy in that of others, and will share his sources of joy with them. He will think of

the Universe as friendly and full of pleasant surprises and undreamed of possibilities, for God will be to him all and more than all of the best he has seen in father and mother, nearer, dearer, more able to help.

The child is the creator of the new world. He is born with wonderful creative possibilities. How often do we fetter and crush down the spirit of expectance and high endeavour by a cast-iron discipline ! How often do we let it run to seed in selfish pleasure and waywardness by an unthinking indulgence ! Neither by cutting off all his eccentricities, trying to fit his free spirit into our narrow systems and thwarting his finer instincts on the one hand, nor by letting him think himself the centre of the universe on the other hand, are we to help him to turn these wonderful faculties into fruitful channels. The parents in the Christian revolutionary home think of the child as the great revolutionary, and believe that in the march of humanity toward world peace and true righteousness and liberty " a little child shall lead them." It is this faith which will make them above all eager to see the love that rules in the home, a rule which all respect and which expresses itself between husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, servant and employer (if there be servants), and where the final appeal is always the appeal of love.

III

The second aspect under which I wish to consider the social function of the family as a creative force is that of community of purpose. If love is to be the law of the family it cannot be limited to the narrow circle of the home ; it must find a wider expression. Just as there is a love of country that issues in suspicion and hatred towards other countries, so there is a love of family that expresses itself in a supercilious and overbearing attitude towards other and especially what are regarded as socially inferior families, and that so far from being

a constructive force for the new order is a very evil symptom of and bulwark for the old. In fact I think it may be fairly said that a great deal of the common idea of family loyalty is potentially if not actively antagonistic towards other families. It may be a survival of the days when each family had to fend for itself and was economically independent of other families. It is kept up by a false idea of economic isolation and greatly fostered by the laws of inheritance in most civilised communities. I believe that one of the first steps which a Christian community would take towards expressing its own ideals would be the discontinuance of the practice of leaving hoarded wealth to one's children (even before any complete system of communism might have been worked out), not only because of the great evil done to the child who inherits a fortune, but also because of the way in which this practice contributes towards family exclusiveness.

The very idea of the family, looked at from the wider sociological point of view, is one of service to the community. To propagate the race is the prime social function, and though few men and women marry with this aim consciously before them, this is the deeper purpose that lies behind the institution of the family. But of course, from an ethical, and still more from a Christian revolutionary point of view, the mere propagation of the race is a wholly inadequate idea of the social function of the family. We want to consider what kind of society we are to perpetuate or create, and so the function of the family relative to the future of mankind, is a deeply ethical and religious as well as a merely physical one. Recent writers have urged that what is happening in the more highly industrialised countries to-day is that the community is being augmented much more rapidly from the less fit and less progressive elements, and that the higher types and those whose education has led to a higher standard of living are practising voluntary limitation of families by late marriage and in other ways. "The sections that are

dwindling include the whole middle-class and the skilled artisans. The sections that are increasing are the very poor, the shiftless and drunken, the feeble-minded—the feeble-minded women, especially, are apt to be very prolific. . . . What is regrettable *at present* is not the decline of the birth-rate in itself, but the fact that the decline is greatest in the best elements of the population.”*

I am not concerned to argue how far this contention is justified, or as to the value of the standards used in forming such an estimate. Let us suppose the facts to be as stated by Bertrand Russell, and other writers, and the danger to be a very great one—what is the way by which we can deal with the situation? There are methods of public discussion, of education, of quickening the social conscience on these matters that are open to the Christian revolutionary, along the lines suggested in the previous chapter. But perhaps his chief contribution will be in his own home. This is the crucible in which his experiments can be made. If he realises that his home is to perform a social function, that it does not live to itself; he will not allow self-regarding motives to determine his attitude on the delicate problems raised. A man and woman coming together in this spirit will seek to contribute as largely as possible to the ultimate solution of this problem. They will not allow a false standard of comfort for themselves or the object of training such children as they have to take a certain position in their social circle, to stand in the way of their fulfilling their prime function to society. They will see that their home contributes to the world its full share† of young life inspired by the highest ideals of social service, so far as it is possible for the parents to ensure this. As the child matures the parents will seek to help him to identify himself freely with the

* Bertrand Russell, *op. cit.*, pp. 178 and 182.

† It seems to me that childless Christian parents should, for example, far more frequently adopt orphan or other children, not a single child, as a contribution to the community.

aims of the home, to create in all the world the family spirit. Social distinctions will not bar the home to any. As far as circumstances permit men of various races will be welcomed to it. It will have a universal atmosphere. Mutual consideration within the family circle will not be allowed to develop into family selfishness. The education of the child will be determined not by personal ambition or family pride or greed of gain, but by the controlling aim, the question being, What faculties has this child by which he may serve his fellows and how can they best be developed towards that end ?

There are few things more forceful in human society than a family thus devoted to a common purpose, to a great cause of human betterment. I know such families where almost every child has gone abroad as a missionary or who has been inspired with the missionary motive, where the selfless passion of the parents has worked out in a great multiplication of their power of good through children who have been infected and brought into the sweep of a great purpose. Other families have sought expression in other forms of public service, or in the devotion to some craft, worked at in a spirit of delight in the thing produced, and in making it for the service of men. For it is not simply in such tasks as preaching and teaching or healing that this spirit of service must express itself. A recent picture of Jesus at work in His shop may be allowed to illustrate the point :—

“ He showed me how to make wooden locks, and how to bore the holes in the ox-yokes, and I marvelled when I saw the care with which he worked when He fitted the yoke-pegs. I told Him so and He said, ‘ The oxen are working to make our bread. If the yoke does not fit they will suffer and their owner will always be adjusting it. If you love your neighbours you want them to work without irk. Therefore I take pains.’

“ ‘ Will your neighbour be pleased ? ’ I asked.

“ ‘ Each time he puts this yoke on his oxen and sees how well it fits, his heart ought to glow within him and he be full of love. But if it is not so, what then? God sends his rain on the just and the unjust, and the man has paid for the yoke.’ ”*

For a family engaged in any industry to work in such a spirit is to be making a gift of the highest value to the creating of a new social order.

But the eugenicist will urge that this is not enough, that we cannot deal with this problem save by regulation of marriages and control of the birth-rate, and perhaps by altering the whole idea of the family as it has been developed in western civilisation. I grant that if we concentrate attention on this problem alone it may seem insoluble apart from State action in some direction. But we are trying to judge every question from the standpoint of our ultimate aim for society, and in the light of that aim the very methods suggested seem to me to threaten what is of even greater importance. The way of the Christian revolution may be slow, or if we really tried it, even in this matter, it may prove to be very quick; but at least it is wholly creative. From the heart of a family animated by such a common purpose there will pass into society the health-giving currents that will do more than any restrictive measures to remake the world.

IV

The third element in the family life is the most important of all; it is the conscious relation of the family to God. Just as love within the family is no sufficient principle unless it expresses itself in a purpose of good to wider circles, so the love of such wider circles needs to be part of a devotion to God as the Father of All. “ Self-sacrifice is akin to worship. To be justified it requires to be in the service of the Divine or universal

* *By an Unknown Disciple*, p. 120.

ideal. In other words, it must be, consciously or unconsciously, in co-operation with God's purpose for our world that we lose ourselves if by such losing we may find ourselves."* In the family circle this relation to God may best be consciously developed in a perfectly natural way. The habit of mind that is created in a home where God's presence is daily recognised is one in which religion is not an artificial, external matter of rites and creeds. It is the breath we breathe, the most natural and real fact in the family life. *Crede experto*. In my previous volume this view of religion is explained, and I owe this, as my dedication there will show, more than anything else to a home where God was taken for granted as a loving Father, not dragged in on occasion as a terrible or even as a benevolent outsider.

I know that it is quite possible for the religious exercises of the home to become perfunctory and lifeless. Where that happens they had far better be abandoned. It seems to me that a mere form of religion is one of the chief factors in destroying real religion. But, in my experience, the child naturally turns to God, and very often thinks far deeper thoughts of Him than His elders give him credit for. It is our artificial ideas of God, our theological and abstruse conceptions that are unreal to him. Prayer comes very easily to most children, if taught in a perfectly natural way, and often it awakens deep reasonings in the heart of quite small children. One of my boys, taught at the beginning of the war to pray for children in Germany (he was five and a half years old at the time) stopped suddenly and asked, "Does God love the Germans too, or only us?" When his mother told him that the Germans were, of course, as much the objects of His love as we were, the quick response came, "then is He sorry when we kill them?" This is but one instance, and who that has taught a child to pray cannot quote many of the ways in which the reference of all to God is taken up literally by the child, and becomes second nature to him

* *Practice of Christianity*, p. 266.

A family in which God's presence is thus assumed is one in which the problems of discipline, punishment and mutual consideration are easily handled. Personally I find the practice of beginning the day with a reference of everything to God, frequently sitting silent together in the recollection of His presence rather than by using any words of prayer, is a most helpful one—and I should feel that the home lost immeasurably by its discontinuance. To learn to think of God as interested even in the details of our life and still to have reverence and to avoid the danger of praying as if God were a family or tribal deity—these are some of the objects to set before ourselves. If Jesus was right in thinking that the great need of men was to relate their lives individually and corporately to the Father's supreme purpose, if it be the fact that only so can a real reconciliation among men or nations be accomplished, if our highest good can only be found in right relations to our fellows in accordance with the divine purpose and in personal fellowship with our Father—then surely it is never too soon to show the child this way and help him to take it freely and naturally. This can only be done by parents who themselves take it ; but even some who do take it for themselves seem to shrink from sharing it with their children—even while they know it to be the greatest good they possess. This is due sometimes to a self-depreciation that is not wholly good, sometimes to a natural reserve that should surely be overcome when dealing with one's own children, and sometimes perhaps to mere thoughtlessness of what we are really withholding from them. For if they do not see in their parents any expression of their deepest life, is it not certain that they will miss something of what the parent really owes to them ?

The Christian revolutionary home will be one in which all delight to do the will of God, where it is acknowledged as the rule of the home, where actions and habits are tested by it, where all are joined in

discovering ever new meanings of it. And let us be very sure the smallest children will usually be the chief discoverers and the chief means of discovering it to their elders. Nothing opens up the mind of God to us more wonderfully and more excitingly than humbly watching His way with little children.

V

In the light of these thoughts I must return to the assumption with which I began. If the kind of service to the community which I have outlined is to be rendered by the home it does not need much argument to show that it can best be rendered by a family life of the type I have described and based upon the ideas assumed. Take, for example, the ideal of life-long monogamy as the one which is being most strongly assailed to-day. To quote one writer, Bertrand Russell says, "Mutual liberty, which is now demanded is making the old form of marriage impossible. . . . A new system is required, if the European nations are not to degenerate, and if the relations of men and women are to have the strong happiness and organic seriousness which belonged to the best marriages in the past. The new system must be based upon the fact that to produce children is a service to the community, and ought not to expose parents to heavy pecuniary penalties. . . . It ought to admit that, although life-long monogamy is best when it is successful, the increasing complexity of our needs makes it increasingly often a failure for which divorce is the best preventive."*

The Christian revolutionary, seeing in the family the germ out of which the new social order is to be developed, is keen to maintain and glorify the institution of marriage. His concern is certainly not to coerce unwilling persons into maintaining a relationship that has lost any meaning and value, and there can be no

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 192-6.

defence, from his point of view, of a system that makes divorce easy for the rich and for certain classes of the community, and hard, if not impossible, for others. At the same time he sees a real value in the fixity of relationship and the continuity of the home, so that in this little community it may be possible adequately to work out the kind of life and mutual relationship which, if extended throughout society, would bring real social health. After all in the larger world we are under necessity to live with our neighbours, and for most people the choice of co-workers and others with whom our lives must be lived is strictly limited. In England a man and woman can at least choose for themselves as to whether they will (by marrying) live together or not, and their children have no such chance. The art of living is largely the art of adaptation. Thus there is much to be said for a system that makes it far from easy to change the relationship (quite apart from any question of religious authority).

But the Christian revolutionary is concerned chiefly to get the utmost out of the system, to breathe into it a new spirit, to make it a real factor in the creation of the Kingdom of God. This is his contribution to the problem. I am interested to see that Bertrand Russell himself catches a glimpse of the thing that I am here trying to say. "I doubt [he writes] if there is any radical cure except in some form of religion so firmly and sincerely believed as to dominate even the life of instinct." And again, "As religion dominated the old form of marriage, so religion must dominate the new. But it must be a new religion based upon liberty, justice, and love, not upon authority and law and hell-fire."* All this shows that he has failed to see the religion of Jesus in its true light. I venture to say that the religion that has, to quote his words, "dominated the old form of marriage" has in very many cases been just this religion of liberty, justice and love that he desiderates. That is the religion I have tried to expound

* *Op. cit.*, p. 191.

and plead for in my previous volume* ; it is the only kind of religion that can hold the youth of the world as it sets out freshly, as each generation must, on the task of making creative homes.

Having been compelled to criticise him in another particular, I take the greater pleasure in quoting Professor Urwick's opinion on this question, as one which, from a somewhat different angle, supports the view I have taken. " We can now assert boldly," he says, " that marriage, like every other human relationship, has a supreme purpose as a means of training, disciplining, and developing the self out of its self-hood. It is perhaps more valuable than any other relationship, because it is better fitted for this purpose than any other ; and its fitness rests in great measure upon its absolute permanence, upon the crude fact that there is no easy escape from its difficulties, that the bed made by choice must be lain upon of necessity, that the partner chosen must be made partner, even though the imagined possibility of human joy must be permanently abandoned in this case or that. Shall we make it easier to dissolve the relationship and so start again with new hope in pursuit of the joy we have missed ? The device is too easy to be the right one ; and such a device adopted with such a motive, resting upon such a conception of purpose, is foredoomed to failure. Not, however, chiefly because the will-o'-the-wisp which the disappointed husband or wife dreams of will never be caught, but because the conversion of marriage into a device for catching it means robbing the relationship of its highest purpose." †

In the same way the assumption of real sex-equality is fundamental to this conception of the function of the home. That which the man renders to the woman is the same as that which the woman renders to the man. There can be no idea of a different moral standard either in sexual relationships or in smaller matters of

* See especially *Lay Religion*, Chapters V, VI, and IX.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 204.

freedom and self-expression. Each owes to the other a perfect devotion, an obedience of love, in the sense that love delights to do the will of the loved one, but no obedience of the unwilling slave. In the Quaker form of marriage, with which I am familiar, the words used by the contracting parties are exactly the same, each promising to be faithful and loving to the other. This is the natural expression of an idea of sex equality that permeates the whole Society, its ministry, its church meetings, the holding of office of any kind. To my mind this is the true working out of the truth discovered, though not fully applied by Paul when he said, "In Christ the distinctions between male and female disappear."* It is a significant fact that the history of the Society of Friends, where this conception of equality has been so fully expressed, shows scarcely any record of divorce. The principle of sex-equality will, of course, also express itself in the relations of boy and girl within the family and in the equal educational opportunity given to each.

VI

What will be the consequences of working out within the home the way of the Christian Revolution as pictured in the Sermon on the Mount? It will surely mean the making of experiments that will be criticised and misunderstood. A curious if trivial example comes to my notice on the very day of my writing these pages. In Chinese society (in many places) the idea of man and woman being seen together on the street is so novel as to be felt to be indecent. A Christian teacher was told that his wife's health could only be restored by daily open-air exercise. At the close of his day's work he walked out with her openly, because he felt this to be the right expression of the Christian relationship of man and wife under the

* Gal. iii. 28 (Weymouth).

circumstances—thus braving the strongest opposition and even social ostracism. In other families the method of solving the “servant problem” will awaken the same kind of comment from neighbours in the particular circle; in other cases it may be the entertainment of all classes, or the willingness to welcome those who have “lost their reputation” into the home circle; in some cases I know of, bringing a distressed Austrian or German into the home during war-time, has meant the closing of many houses to the experimenters.

But the risks are not simply unfavourable comment or exclusion from a particular social circle. I know other cases where parents have felt they must take the risk of sending their children to school where physical or even moral contagion was much more than a remote possibility. And this has been done not through financial necessity, but in order that the family might be fully identified with the families in the same neighbourhood, who had no choice. I dare not urge any such course, which is of the same order as the risks which missionary parents take for their children when they have to deny them the constant comfort and help of their own home for years together for reasons of health or education. In both cases I think it is a case of the individual sense of duty. But where such risks are taken under such a sense they are experiments of the type I have been describing, carried out with the object of making, through the family, the largest possible contribution to the creation of a new social order. Where families feel it right to make such experiments, the Christian community should do its utmost to help and to make the experiment a success.

Much more frequently the risks will be economic. It may be that the main purpose of the family will be such that not only is any idea of great comfort or wealth abandoned, but actual penury is risked. I know such cases, and few things seem to me more creative than the witness of a family that is so devoted to a great social purpose as to throw aside all hope of

ease and condemn itself to toil and hardship. But even apart from the choosing of a purpose that guides all the family decisions, there are very many claims that may be called minor ones which, if responded to with pure love, entail real sacrifice. "It is unquestionably true that in the world as it is, neither man, woman, nor child can follow the promptings of the tender heart to the exclusion of the hard heart without suffering the loss of material advantage. Let the little boy or girl, even in the shelter of our best primary school, try it, and we know the result. Let the house mother in her cottage try it ; if she does not limit the service she might give to her sick neighbour, her own house is not clean ; if she does not limit her gifts to the starving orphan, she cannot lay by for her own children.

. . . In the world as it is, the loss of material welfare and life itself may always, and often must be, the first result of tender-heartedness in which there is no variableness or shadow of turning ; but that was just what Jesus foretold."*

It is just such ventures which are of the very essence of the Christian revolution. In the home life most activities of this kind have no outward glory attached to them, they are not done so as to be seen of men ; they involve a type of suffering that must be silently and cheerfully borne, and that seems to have little to show for it. But whenever I think of such homes hope springs up freshly in my heart. Their value is beyond rubies. It is in these obscure corners, behind these doors which shut out the curious gaze of the multitude that the fairest flowers of love are blooming. Because of such homes the ancient words are fulfilled, "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them ; the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose."†

Can it be doubted that such homes are among the most potent factors toward the new creation we so

* *The Practice of Christianity*, p. 70.

† Isa. xxxv. 1.

sorely need? Let there be families where love really rules within the family and in all external relationships, where a great purpose of social good permeates all, and with which the growing children become infected and inspired, where there is a natural happy sense of the divine Father's presence and where all is related to Him and springs forth from Him, and these same characteristics must begin to show themselves throughout society. The social organism is what men and women, reared in homes (in most cases) have made it. The society of the future must be what the men and women who are now the children in our homes shall fashion. Handicapped they may be by the failures and blunders of their forefathers. Opposed they may be by children whose homes have been preparing them for a perpetuation of the strife and greed of this old order. But if they have learned at home the splendid joy of service, the glory of striving for a worthy if unpopular cause, the lasting satisfaction of work well-done, not for profit but for the use of their fellows, the sure hope of the triumph of good which is born of simple-hearted communion with God and with their brethren—they will not be soured by opposition or lack of appreciation, nor will they be turned from the way by specious argument or subtle flattery. Such homes sending forth such persons are the hope of humanity; they are the first line in the advance of the Christian Revolution.

CHAPTER VII
THE SCHOOL

Christianity made a direct attack upon all sense of status, yet it could not free the education of the Roman empire of Pedantry, and even St. Augustine thought that the style of the Gospel was bad. A Christian might condemn all culture as Pagan ; he did not make the deadlier attack upon the culture of his time that it was no longer culture because it was pedantic. He did not see that Christianity, if all its principles were acted upon, meant a new life to culture itself, a new sense of adventure and beauty which must produce great art and literature and philosophy. And we have not seen this even to the present day. We still appeal to one sense of status or another in our education, and in that appeal we are constantly falling into one kind of pedantry or another.

A. CLUTTON-BROCK.

The entire object of our education is to make people not merely *do* the right things, but *enjoy* the right things—not merely industrious, but to love industry—not merely learned, but to love knowledge—not merely pure, but to love purity—not merely just, but to hunger and thirst after justice.

JOHN RUSKIN.

CHAPTER VII
THE SCHOOL

I

IT is a noteworthy fact that many modern writers and thinkers on education are approaching the problems of the School from a point of view very similar to that of this volume. The educational world is seething with ideas and many hopeful experiments are being made. It seems almost presumptuous for one who can make no claim to being an educationist to write even one chapter on this subject. I cannot, of course, deal with the subject at all adequately, even as it touches the aim of this volume, but there are some things which must be said, however inadequate the treatment as a whole may be.

I begin with the thought of Jesus in regard to the child. In His teaching the child is central. When the disciples disputed on matters of status and priority, He took a child and set him in the midst* ; when the important people of His circle pushed aside the children as unworthy of His notice, He drew them to Himself tenderly and told these same elder persons that it was to the child-like the Kingdom belonged.† Unless they could enter it as children they would be excluded. To be born again was the condition of seeing the Kingdom.‡ Helping the least was helping Him.§ Injuring the child was the deadly sin.||

So we see that to Jesus reverence for the child is a fundamental thought. Any education that is true to His spirit and teaching must begin there. His hope

* Mark ix. 36.

§ Matt. xxv. 40.

† Mark x. 13-16.

|| Mark ix. 42.

‡ John iii. 3.

centres in the children and the child spirit. To injure such, to wound their consciences or to fetter them in their joyous hopeful life is to put back the cause of the Kingdom. What is it in the child that calls forth this enthusiasm, and how may we come to share it as we must if we are to be true educators? Having some measure of this enthusiasm, how is it to find its way into the work of education, and make schools which shall be the centres for the Christian Revolution? These are the questions to which we must confine our attention in this chapter. Jesus seemed to see in the child the unspoiled product of the Creative Mind. Looking away from the men who were concerned in keeping up the pretence of an unreal society, who were jealous and self-seeking and distrustful and hard-hearted His pure soul found in the child just that directness, spontaneity, tenderness of spirit, and eager hope that responded to the same qualities in Himself. How could he fail to be enthusiastic? It was essential to His hope for the Kingdom that the child should not be spoiled. Like Mencius, He knew that "he is great who does not lose his child-heart." How could children mature without losing that treasure? How could they find a place in this very grown-up world and still be true to the essential nature that God had given them? Such would seem to be the problem suggested, if not explicitly, by Jesus Christ.

We may look perhaps more closely at the child spirit, and allow ourselves to analyse its nature, while remembering that it is the entire impression and meaning of the child that we must take into our hearts, not a complex of abstract qualities. Jesus calls us to look at the child with the eyes of an artist rather than with

* I am not wishing to raise here the problem of "original sin." The discussion is a barren one at the best. We are on far safer ground when we acknowledge the plain fact of human experience that "All *have* sinned, and come short of the glory of God." That every child is born into the world with something of the divine, a nature made for God and therefore akin to God's, is fundamental to my thought.

those of a scientist, to appreciate not to dissect. With this caution, we may note what it is that we can appreciate.

In the child we see the ideal of purity and innocence, not, of course, the virtue which is won through hard conflict with evil, but the eyes that have not learned to see evil or to suspect it. This is part of that singleness of mind which so few seem able to retain in this complex world, a oneness of life keeping in mind the isolated object and seeking it with the whole being. Very often education takes this away from the child at a very early age. We introduce him into a world where men's motives are very complex and even tortuous, we teach him that he cannot trust his instincts. For example, if it is his instinct to give a straight answer to a straight question, we take pains to show him (more by example than precept) that it is not always safe or convenient to "blurt out" the truth. We introduce a complex into his mind which robs him of just the quality we admire in him, and then we deplore the result! This is our clumsy way of helping the child to adapt himself to what we are pleased to call "real life." We need eyes to see that it is he who is living in real life and that we are ourselves in an artificial world. Jesus saw that it was just this quality in the child which gave the supreme vision, "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God."*

"See that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father who is in heaven."†

Closely akin to this quality is the loyalty of the little child. Anyone who has had the priceless treasure of the undivided loyalty and love of a child knows how it awakens all that is best in one, how it stirs one's heart and strengthens one's belief in God and in human nature. This power in the child, quite unconscious as it is, is the same power on which Jesus Himself relied

* Matt. v. 8.

† Matt. xviii. 10.

to win the ungrateful and hard-hearted. A trust that goes on trusting when all appears hopeless, a loyalty that will be loyal to a friend who has disappointed one again and again—is not this the very quality that Jesus showed in dealing with Judas Iscariot and with Peter. I pause for a moment to illustrate it in what seems to me a most penetrating study of the former in *By an Unknown Disciple*. Judas stumbles across the supposed writer after he has betrayed his Master and breaks out into a bitter cry of self-reproach.

“ Oh, man, can you not see what has happened to me? A door has opened in me and I have seen my own soul. What is there left for me but death? I have told them, yea, in their very sanctuary, that I have sinned, but they do not care. It is not their business they said. No one cares save Jesus, and I have sent Him to His death. He trusted me. Even though He knew I should betray Him He risked His life and trusted, and I did betray Him ! ”

“ He sat down beside me. His dark eyes were full of pain and like a bewildered child he put his hand on my arm.

“ ‘ That I should have done this to Him when I love Him. It was for Him I would have fought. ’ ”*

No one can say whether this be a true account of the mind of Judas, but at least we can feel that it is essentially true to the way of Jesus. It is just this spirit of unswerving loyalty—unreasoning loyalty, if you will—that He exemplified so amazingly, and that, when He saw it in others, awakened such enthusiasm in Him. Was it not this quality that called forth his delighted comment on the woman who broke the box of ointment? She was acting in the very same spirit that would so soon send Him, unresisting, to the Cross. Can we doubt that He had known the unstinted affection and trust of little children, and that He not only valued it Himself but saw in this the quality that men need to break down evil and bring out the good in

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 244, 5.

others, the weapon which love can use when all others fail?

How soon do we rob the child of this quality also! We let him see that it is most dangerous to trust people until we are assured of their trustworthiness. Our own suspicious attitude infects him. He sees us always afraid of giving ourselves away. So, very quickly, he grows away from the trustful loyal habit, and loses a power that he can only regain by becoming again like a little child, and it may be through the agony of bitter repentance.

I have already spoken of the child as the creator of the future. Whether he is building castles with his bricks or out of sand, or weaving wonderful tales out of his untaught imagination, he is never so happy as when he is making something for himself. Is there any joy like the joy of creation in fellowship? It is in such play together that children begin to know this joy. To see them, to share with them in such efforts, is to get away from the mechanical world, where everything runs like a train on the railway lines, into the great spaces of the open country-side. The passion of the heart of Jesus was to create something new and splendid in this world where men were getting into ruts. Can we not see how eagerly He would look to the children to share with Him in so splendid an adventure? In them He saw the hope of success in His life-work. They had not yet had it drilled into them that everything must be brought to "the test of safe experience." Their spirits were not satisfied unless they were trying new experiments. The child's life is a long series of such experiments until he discovers enough of his environment, and of how to adjust himself to it, to be able to take his place in the world. All the tendency of educational theory that emphasises activity as a means of learning, that urges the necessity of expression if there is to be any lasting impression, is of the utmost help to the Christian revolutionary in seeking to make the school a real

training ground for the makers of a new world. For it is in creative activities, especially in fellowship with others, that we draw near to God Himself. Jesus, when reprov'd for healing on the Sabbath, met the view of creation as a finished work, the present age a long Sabbath of God, by saying "My Father worketh even until now, and I work,"* showing that His sense of unity with the Father grew out of or was bound up with His co-operation with Him in His creative activity. So if the creative activities of God in human society are to go forward, He needs the child-spirit full of restless activity, eager for adventure. It is through such that He works. "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

For such creative work the child needs and possesses the expectant attitude. For him the world is no closed circuit made according to incontrovertible law, destined to run on for ages until it runs down. He lives in a world "all alive with its own possibilities." The wood in which his feet stray may hide armies of fairies. To-morrow a royal prince may stop at his humble door. Is not every child, at least for some small section of his existence, like Peggy Malone to whose christening the fairies had come and "given her the blessed power of seeing what isn't there, and with a gift like that, who need trouble about what is there?"† One of the most certain and least deliberate results of our mechanistic education is to cut out this wonderful world from the life of the child. The teaching of the "laws of nature" in a rigid way without imagination or a sense of God behind the Universe, nay more, God in it all active and free, tends to shut the child up into a ready-made system.

"The crimson was fading into cold October gray as I came upon him—twelve years old and just an ordinary boy, his garden fork under the hill of potatoes

* John v. 17.

† From "Flames Across the Sea," in *A Communion of Sinners* by Evelyn Sharp, p.145.

he had started to dig, his face upturned, his eyes following far off the flight of a wild duck across the sky.

He who from zone to zone,

I began more to myself than to him,

Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,

he went on, as much to himself as to me.

“ ‘Father,’ he added reflectively, as the bird disappeared down the dusky slope of the sky, ‘I’m glad I know that piece.’

“ ‘Why?’ I asked.

“ ‘I see so much more when the wild ducks fly over.’

“ ‘How much more do you see?’

“ ‘I see the wild ducks and God flying over together.’ ”

“ And is he a poet who sees less? Beauty and truth that do not reach religion do not reach the human heart. An education that lacks religion must lack authority. . . . Religion is the consciousness of the universe—that it is infinite, eternal, and that it is all God’s! ”*

The child who knows that he is living in his Father’s house, where the same Hand cares for the ravens and clothes the lilies and provides for all his need, is the child who can think in terms of a new creation. Education that does not preserve or bring back this glorious sense of the possibilities of life is not what the Christian revolutionary seeks.

These are but some of the things, as it seems to me that Jesus must have seen in the “little ones,” and that called forth His enthusiasm and His respect for them. Their tenderness, their quick intuitions and sympathy with suffering, their joyousness, their love of fun, their wonder—how much more than words can express rises in our mind as we allow ourselves to come under the

* From an article on “Education for Authority,” by D. L. Sharp, *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1921, p. 16.

spell of the child. A true teacher must so allow himself. He must be one who really finds the child, or the child will not find him. The dignity that must be maintained in the class-room, the sense of superior wisdom, the repression necessary to keep order, —how far these are from the free and natural relations of teacher and child that must come out of the same view of children that Jesus had !

It is by living with children humbly and patiently that we shall catch the enthusiasm of Jesus. We shall come to see how true a sense of values the child has and to check our sophistries by it ; we shall come to share the child's joys and sorrows and know our own life far richer for doing so ; we shall come to respect his personality and so learn to lead him into a true expression of it rather than drive him into what we should like him to be. These things take time. Our crowded programmes are a chief enemy of really good work. There are many things we can let go, many avenues of knowledge we need not tread. But if we have anything to do with the training of children this avenue we must tread at all costs—the avenue of understanding, imagination, friendship with children, winning them to ourselves for their own dear sakes, seeing beyond their naughtiness, and bashfulness, their impudence or wilfulness to the fine thing that lies there at the centre never to be touched save by reverent and loving hands.

II

In some such spirit as this we may proceed then to look at the aims of the school. Four seem to me to stand out as the dominant ones, including to a large extent, if not entirely, all that may reasonably be brought into our general aim of making the school a powerful factor in the creation of a new world.

1. The school should help to develop the scholar along the lines of his own personality ; it should help

him to express himself, to direct his intuitions, to restrain what tends to destroy his best life, to co-ordinate his powers so that he may do well that creative work to which his nature calls him.

2. The school should help in passing on to the scholar the heritage of the past ; it should make him alive to the meaning of the past for to-day, watchful to profit by the experience of others as well as by his own, a conscious partner in the processes through which men are moving on to some great goal, reverent towards the figures and achievements of the past without being fettered as he faces the future.

3. The school should help to equip the scholar to take his right place in the life of the community ; it should show him how to use his freedom without encroaching on that of others, how to take his share in the production of the necessities of life or ministering to the community in useful ways ; above all it should help in giving him the spirit of service and co-operation so that he may want to work for and live at peace with his fellow-men.

4. The school should help to give the scholar true standards for judgment ; it should aim to send him out not an uncritical absorber of all that he can pick up with the new powers he has acquired at school, but rather one who will choose the good and reject the evil and who will thus contribute not merely to the world's work but to the creation of a public conscience.

For the fulfilment of all these aims the student should learn the art of relating his life, his thoughts, his hopes and ambitions to God his Father. Religion is not, in my view, a separate aim ; the whole aim is religious, and, unless religion is the atmosphere of the school, "religious teaching" will be vain or even harmful.

The religious aim includes as its largest ingredient the deepening in the child of the instinct of love and service, the control of the instinct of acquisitiveness and domination. It is in the school that the child

should begin to apply the principle of love to a wider society and one where, perhaps for the first time, he discovers that there are unfriendly persons in the world. By the use of co-operative methods, in the place of competitive ones, by checking the tendency to retaliate whenever an insult is offered and showing the child how, rather, to conquer by love, by forms of community service, above all by the example of patience and love, the teacher has an immense power in developing and directing the loving spirit in the child. Why do we encourage our boys to stand up and even to fight for their rights, when Jesus bids us turn the other cheek? Why, when war is so horrible a thing, do we teach our children to play at soldiers? Why does the school give military drill and teach history as a long series of bloody conflicts? To train men and women to live in love with all the world—this should be the dominating purpose of the school—for to live in love is to live with God who is love—and the one great need of our troubled humanity is *more love*, which means more loving persons.

How may the school fulfil these aims? To answer this question fully would be to write a whole treatise on education. A few thoughts may be thrown out in passing before we try to show the essential difference between the school for the Christian revolution and certain other types of schools with which we are familiar to-day.

The school where the first of our aims is followed will be one in which great care is taken not to overload the curriculum with set subjects, where time is given to study the individual, where there is a very large measure of freedom, where external punishment is used very sparingly if at all. "One must not be timid about the according of a full measure of freedom," writes a teacher of some experience in this matter. "On one occasion, back before the war, when my third form was flooded with new boys, I told them in the most deliberate tone that there was 'no possible hope

of getting a punishment,' and I never knew the sternest of actual punishments produce a more healthy or a more lasting effect. This is the form in which in two terms there was not a single boy who did not work with real enthusiasm for nine-tenths of his time. There is something challenging in a strong and vigorous declaration of this perfect immunity from external pressure, but the same words could not have the same effect on a class doomed to sit silent while the master talked."*

I am free to admit that this experience is not one to be always expected when a like course is taken, and very much depends on the personality of the teacher. At the same time I should maintain that there has been much greater danger of erring in the opposite direction and thinking that the cure for all forms of schoolboy disorder is punishment "to fit the crime." The great aim should surely be to have such a spirit in the school that the supposed need for punishment is eliminated. As the spirit of the school gets hold of the child he can be appealed to far more effectively in other ways. And this means that his own personality is being called out and that he is taking on the responsibility of making the school worthy of its reputation, which involves making himself a worthy member of it. In such a school each pupil is the special care of the teacher and is studied as a person with a view to his own proper development. It is a delight to talk over with a teacher at such a school the progress of the child one loves, for one finds how his strength and weakness are alike appreciated and how the treatment of him is not that of a case but that of a person.

There will be ample room in such a school for initiative on the part of the scholars. The part of the teacher will often be to advise and watch sympathetically rather than to instruct. There will be a large amount of actual creative work, carpentry, handwork

* *The Child's Path to Freedom*, by Norman MacMunn, p. 150.

of various kinds, drawing, essay-writing, calculated both to give the child scope to develop his bent and to reveal to the teacher the possibilities of his personality. The child will be encouraged to think things out for himself, and to learn the art of reflection instead of simply memorising what others have discovered. Very much of what I am here saying has, of course, been said much more adequately in progressive educational writing. All I can hope to do is to insist on this tendency as of prime importance if the school is to prepare for the Christian revolution.

In regard to the second aim it seems to me of great importance that history should be taught in the right way. I welcome, for example, the work of Mr. H. G. Wells, both as emphasising the universal element, the contribution of every race and age to the making of society and also as emphasising the deeper currents that have been affecting our common life rather than the surface episodes, wars especially, that get a quite disproportionate amount of attention in ordinary schools. History must be made the basis of thinking for the future, and here I should like again to quote from Mr. MacMunn's illuminating little volume. "If children are to be taught to look back to the past of the race they should also be taught to exercise their imaginations on looking forward. If this were habitually done in all schools, it is quite possible that it would have a definite effect in producing a more open-minded and progressive type of human being. . . . The eyes of a great boy look to the future of himself and his fellows, to a world in which beauty appears in the terms of wonderful change and progress, and not in the mumbling of old watchwords. He sometimes despises inordinately the past as he sees it now, because its claims are exaggerated in his hearing, but give him the chance to look into the vistas of the future, and the past will become to him a primatively beautiful thing, giving him fresh food for his dreams and inspiring his plans."*

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 105, 142.

The cramming of historical facts, dates, details of battles and so forth, especially for examination purposes, seems to have no relation to this aim. Even a young child can be given the "feel" of belonging to a great whole, through well directed study of the things about him, through a visit to a cathedral or a museum for example. Life comes to have an immense significance; freedom is seen to have a relation to the development of a great purpose of unity, and not merely to an isolated aim. Such education helps a child to place himself, and so saves him from the pure individualism which a too exclusive attention to the first aim might produce. It need hardly be pointed out that the teaching of universal history should not be from a nationalistic point of view, as is so often the case. To this point we must return later. While these studies should help a child to relate himself to the past, they must not overawe him so that he accepts the past as his standard for the future. The attitude of mind in the teaching of history should ever be, "The best is yet to be."

The third aim may be very narrowly construed as a purely vocational training, making the child an efficient machine in the great world of industry. Of course he should be trained to do his share of the world's work, but far more important is the spirit in which he does it. The school itself should be related to the community in such a way as to make each child feel, while already in school, that he is a useful member of society, and that it is a joy to rise to what is expected of him. The idea of co-operation within the school needs to be far more emphasised, children being encouraged to help one another in study and in constructive work. The development of the school as a community centre (so ably carried out in such institutions as Hampton, Tuskegee, Oundle, Srinagar and many others) is a most important way of fulfilling this aim.* Such experiments have by this time amply proved their value on general education principles, not

* Cf. *Education for Life*, by Francis G. Peabody.

only for specialised classes in the community. From our point of view their unique service is that the school is thus related to the actual problem of creating a new world, and that the child's enthusiasm is early turned in this direction. He cannot be in such a school without gaining some conception of his life-work as a contribution to a great social end. There is, of course, very much in the actual teaching of the school that may serve the same purpose, but there is no doubt in my own mind that the actual relation of the school to the community is far more important than the kind of teaching given in the class-room. How to carry this out, especially in big cities, is a problem by no means fully solved, and awaiting the further experiment of such groups as I have described. Mr. Vallentine's school in Indianapolis, described in *Schools of To-morrow*, seems to me to come nearer than any other of which I have knowledge towards solving it.* It is a matter of special interest to me that a number of these schools, besides making a big contribution to general social welfare, are helping materially toward the solution of the "race problem." Of the school just referred to the authors say: "A visitor when leaving this school cannot fail to wish that such ventures might be started in all our great cities, indeed in any community where people need to be aroused to a sense of their needs, including the fact that if they are to contribute to the best interests of the community, they must be taught how to earn a living, and how to use their resources for themselves and their neighbours, both in leisure time and in working hours."†

The fourth of the aims stated above is the one which, in my view, is most easily lost sight of to-day. We must begin with the conviction that every child has an inward standard of values to which we can make our appeal with confidence, and it may well be that in some particulars that standard is more trustworthy than our

* *Schools of To-morrow*, by J. and E. Dewey, Chapter viii.

† *Op. cit.*, p. 207; *cl.* also *Permanent Values in Education*, by Kenneth Richmond, pp. 119ff.

own. Here, then, especially, do we need a real reverence for the child, a willingness to learn, a tender care lest we do injury to a deep inward sense of truth and rightness, which is nothing less than the divine witness in the child's heart. With this attitude we approach the task of seeking to strengthen the good impulses and to lead the child himself to question and reject the evil ones. It is certainly a fact that many children reach the school after having already learned to reject some of their own instincts of good. Perhaps the natural friendliness toward children of different class or colour has been interfered with ; perhaps the readiness to share his good things with others has been checked and he has been started along the pathway of thrift and even greed ; perhaps his standard of truth has been violated by what he has heard at home. The task of the teacher will then be to bring him back to the inward sense of right—no easy one if other influences are constantly working in another direction.

Much of our education seems to me to be like opening windows without helping the child to know when it may be wise to shut them against a disease-laden miasma. We multiply his points of contact with the world, but we give him so little help in knowing which to cultivate. He can read the daily newspaper, but he cannot tell truth from falsehood, the catch-words of a party from the principles of a true social order ; he can go to the " movies " and understand what he sees, but he has no sense of the difference between sensational melodrama and real tragedy ; he is more than ever at the mercy of the quack and the wire-puller, for he can understand their jargon without being able to detect its hollowness. It is because there is a public educated enough to be exploitable that the schemer of the press or of the public platform is able to exploit his enthusiasm and idealism so mercilessly. In the same way clever statesmen, using the laws of mob psychology, can rush the Church, or the general public into a war, not because they have not good

instincts, but because they have not been trained to see the real implications of what they believe, and to test the specious arguments by them. The school that prepares for the Christian revolution seeks to develop in each scholar the real power of independent judgment. The essay, the free debate, natural contact between teacher and pupil, the discussion of public events, are some of the more obvious ways in which this can be done.

III

In the light of these aims let us look at some of the influences which are shaping our schools to-day.

Commercial efficiency.

It goes without saying that the majority of children must be trained to take their place in the productive and distributive work of the world, and that the better they do that work the better it will be, if other things do not suffer. Nevertheless the way in which this influence reacts upon education is often far from helpful. So far as the first and third of our aims is concerned it may be urged that these are stressed from this point of view in order that the child may show initiative and that he may fit into the life of society. But even here we must be on our guard. If the child is developed along the lines of his personality in order that he may become a better money-making machine, or with the idea of his turning his talents to personal profit, the very aim we have stated is a menace rather than a help toward the establishment of the Kingdom of God. If the child is brought into the life of the community to be one more cog in a vast machine, to acquiesce in the competitive system and work it for all it is worth, he will but perpetuate evils already too obvious to need emphasis.

Under this influence the school will become a place where money standards rule, and therefore where class distinctions are kept to the front, where tender-heartedness is constantly curbed by self-interest, where the

competitive idea takes firm root as a fit preparation for going into business. How firm a hold this one idea has on us we can see from almost any school, its system of marks and prizes for doing better than someone else, its examinations and scholarships and so forth. Even the repression of "cheating" may prevent a child from obeying the natural impulse to help another. I do not deny the value of a certain amount of healthy rivalry where all are striving for a common goal. But the spirit it engenders is very apt to be pride in one's own success, jealousy of another's, readiness to use any means to get on, joy in the failure of a rival. These are mean qualities to be called forth in children. Co-operation brings delight in another's achievements, and a spirit of mutual helpfulness. If one fails all suffer. This is the spirit we need for a new world, but to the man who makes commercial efficiency his idol these are marks of weakness. Let competition be mainly with one's own former achievements or with "bogey," where rivalry comes in at all let it be still more clear that all the class is interested in the success of any and that each advance redounds to the honour of all. The children so trained are not being started on the road that leads to making millionaires, let that be quite clear. But they are being started on the road that leads to the Family of God on earth—and I do not find any place for millionaires there.

Militarism.

To anyone who has enough sympathy with the principles stated in this volume to have read thus far it may seem almost needless to urge the danger of this influence in the school. It is, however, so real and prevalent that it cannot be passed by without reference. While the few who may be in positions of high command need a great deal of initiative and originality, the ordinary soldier must be taught to suppress true personality and even his conscience, and to become a mere unit in a vast organisation whose methods and purposes he dare not question. Military discipline is the exact antithesis

of the kind of freedom and fellowship the school should produce. Its exact commands and perfect order may be a beautiful thing to ears and eyes that have become habituated to them; to the child spirit they spell bondage and death.

It is urged that for the third aim an essential point is to learn the art of defence so that one may be a helpful member of a community that may, at any time, be called upon to defend its most precious possessions. A part of this contention may be left over till we deal with the world of nations. But it is well to point out that the social unit considered by the militarist is a limited one, and that, while the social virtues may be emphasised relative to that unit, they are negated relative to others. Thus in a work dealing simply with the school curriculum we read, "To kill the man who is not a member of one's own nation becomes a matter of entire virtue. It is not a crime The nations have institutionalised their anti-social tendencies. They have developed laws, traditions, public opinion, military technique, organisation, training, weapons and other appliances for destroying aliens. And through newspapers, schools, churches and public proclamations, they have arranged to keep all people fully conscious of their anti-social duties, powers and possibilities."*

This is at least a plain statement of a plain fact. Military training is quite inseparable from the idea that there are "anti-social duties" relative to some other nation or nations under some circumstances, and therefore it is utterly antagonistic to the conception of training for a world family where we owe no man anything but love, and have only that weapon whereby to overcome evil. There are plenty of people who urge the value of military training on what it pleases them to call educational grounds. It is supposed to produce "self-reliance, comradeship, concentration of mind, confidence in authority." So far as such aims are good

* Bobbitt, *The Curriculum*, p. 121.

they can be better attained in other ways. To some the last named is doubtless the chief recommendation.* What they want is a nation that will respond at once to the word of command *without thinking for itself*, whether it be in an international or in an inter-class war. For the Christian revolutionary this so-called virtue is one of the cardinal errors in human life. We part company entirely at this point. What other evil thoughts are stirred in the youthful mind by the militarist type of education we cannot stop to discuss. Enough to plead that if the world is ever to have the family spirit the teacher must get away altogether from the militarist influence.†

The State Idea.

In almost every country in the world education tends to come increasingly under State control. Many who read this volume will be able at once to recognise the danger here when they think of what state education did for Germany. But the evil is not confined to any one country. A certain element of uniformity and red tape is almost if not quite inseparable from such education, although there are many signs, in England and America for example, of a more progressive spirit coming into the state system of education. The danger seems to me to lie even more in an exclusively national outlook, and in a glorification of the State as such. The State wants good citizens, and they must be amenable to law and order, ready to answer to any demand the State may make upon them, enthused if not obsessed by national ideals; and full of patriotism. In a world that is always on the verge of war this means an approach to the military ideal that is most perilous.

* Compare General Maxse's advice to the boys of St. Peter's, York, in the following terms: "As regards the Officers' Training Corps, he believed that a humble thing like drill had a great moral effect. By putting men in a row and making them do something at the command of one individual, there was produced a great moral effect" (*Yorkshire Herald*, 3rd July, 1922).

† See *Militarism in Education*, by J. Langdon Davies, especially Chapter X.

But even if there were not this element in State education there would still be the other, the danger of making the State or Nation an end in itself, rather than a means towards the higher end of making good men and women and so creating a world-family.

In Korea we have an example of the way in which religious (Christian) education comes into conflict with a State absolutism. The American missionary believes that an essential part of his work in the school should be to impart to his students an idea of true equality in the sight of God and the worship of Him only. To the Japanese government it is a matter of prime importance that the Korean should accept the Japanese State system, essentially autocratic, and turn to the Mikado as to one who is virtually divine. Hence it seems to me inevitable that there should be a clash between the two, resulting in a severe limitation of Christian educational work and possibly in its extinction. During the war the Government of Burmah issued a long and valuable report on education. Most of it was excellent, but when it came to the question of the sanctions for morality the writers were faced with the obvious difficulty that some of the people were Buddhist and others were Christian. If they urged the value of religious sanctions they were met by the question, What religion? They found refuge in the proposal that morality should be based upon love of country and loyalty to the Empire!* In Upper Nigeria the British Government, anxious to maintain law and order, believes that it must build its administration upon local institutions, some of which are contrary to the highest ideals for which England is supposed to stand. The Government therefore feels justified in excluding Christian teachers because it knows that their presence would introduce new forces tending to destroy these institutions and customs and replace them with Christian ones. These are but a few instances that come to mind to illustrate the way in which the State

* See my article in *The Venturer*, Vol. III, pp. 117-120.

idea of education is actually coming into conflict with the Christian one.

The state idea, then, if it control the school, as it tends to do—and the tendency is of the kind we are apt to speak of as inevitable—will not give proper emphasis to the first of the aims stated, it will exaggerate in a sectional (national) sense the second and the third, and it will not give much weight to the fourth, as governments are prone to think citizens who say “ my country right or wrong ” a greater asset than those who are discriminating and even critical in their loyalty.

To put the matter very baldly, each of the influences we have considered is chiefly working to produce those who will fit into a system, commercial, military or political, already working however well or ill. Boys and girls are so to be trained that they will fit into the present order, perhaps helping to improve it a little, but not too suddenly, and very certainly putting most of their strength into the effort to keep it working. The Christian revolutionary has seen a new order. He is not going to aim to send children into the old one to keep it going as smoothly as possible on the one hand, or, on the other, to blow it up with violence. His aim will be, however, to send forth from his school revolutionary spirits whose joy and labour it will be to create something very far better for industry and for the national life. The child's true self is with him in this aim. He has not to impose his own ideas upon the child, but to see to it that he is not in bondage to the false ideas that have gone to the making of so imperfect a civilisation.

The school that has this aim will be an explosive force in society. Its scholars and teachers will be bound together in a great adventure, living in a community where already through loving service they are beginning the entrancing work of re-creation, studying together the way in which God has been moving in the long ages of the past, dreaming together of how He may yet move in the future if men will but be workers

together with Him in the great design, co-operating in service and in the joy of doing difficult things in the best way, seeing always more deeply into the meaning of that beautiful life that is the standard beyond compare for young and old alike.*

For the supreme object of the school will be to be itself in every detail related to the purpose of God, only so can it prepare children to go out into the world and make of it a veritable Family of God. Each child should learn while in the school, if he has not learned it at home, that only as his life is lived in Christ can he be the creator of a new world. Some children enter this experience very naturally as the unfolding of a blossom, and this surely is the better way. Others there will be, way-ward and tempestuous perhaps, to whom the knowledge comes with difficulty. The forgiving love of God in Christ comes to have a meaning for them when they see how they have been deliberately marring His beautiful plan for their own and other lives. Then to the teacher may be given the joy of bringing his friend into the experience which begins a new life, as he finds out that all his deepest strivings can only be fulfilled through the greatest of all friendships with Christ, the great Deliverer. For this to be presented as a mere intellectual achievement or as the entering of an outward organisation is to deprive the child of its deepest meaning and make what ought to be the most real inward experience, an unreal and outward form. Here, if anywhere, we need reverence.

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell,
That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before,
But vaster.

* A scheme for a Christian Revolutionary school, worked out by members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, will be found in Appendix A.

CHAPTER VIII
THE CHURCH

The conviction has always been embedded in the heart of the Church that "the world"—society as it is—is evil and some time is to make way for a true human society in which the spirit of Jesus Christ shall rule. For fifteen hundred years those who desired to live a truly Christian life withdrew from the evil world to live a life apart. But the principle of such an ascetic departure from the world is dead in modern life. There are only two other possibilities. The Church must either condemn the world and seek to change it, or tolerate the world and conform to it. In the latter case it surrenders its holiness and its mission. The other possibility has never yet been tried with full faith on a large scale. All the leadings of God in contemporary history and all the promptings of Christ's spirit in our hearts urge us to make the trial. On this choice is staked the future of the Church.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

CHAPTER VIII

THE CHURCH

I

AFTER the home and the school—the Church. This seems to be the natural order in the Christian Revolution. The child, born into a family and sent to a school, is, in both communities, given the opportunity to find himself in relation to other persons. He comes slowly to self-consciousness, and as his desire for self-expression increases he should be brought into an appreciation of the fact that his true life can be realised only as it is lived along with others in a fellowship of mutual service. The need of such an environment as will enable him to work out his contribution to the creation of a new social order ought to be met by the Church. The Christian community should provide just that circle of kindred spirits, linked together by a great purpose and a conscious relation to God, that the young man or woman filled with the spirit of the Christian Revolution will naturally wish to join. There he should find the encouragement for his hopes and aspirations, the sympathetic counsel for his plans, the colleagues with whom he may associate, the power to nerve him to his finest efforts without which the struggle will indeed be lonely, if not unavailing. This is the place where the Christian Revolution did actually begin long ago when it was said that the world had been turned upside down by the messengers she had sent forth.* With all the blindness and failure of ourselves and our fathers in the faith, the Church has again and again been the circle where the Christian revolutionaries have been nurtured and from which, with or even without her blessing, they have gone forth into a world that needs

* Cf. Acts. xiii. 1, 2 and xvii. 6.

to be turned upside down as much as ever it did in the first century.

It is a sad fact that to very many of the youth of to-day the Church does not seem at all like this picture, and none of us who know our own and other Christian communities can pretend that the general level of these does other than justify such a view. I have said enough on this side of the picture in my previous volume.* Here we are not going to waste time on discussing mistakes and failures, but rather we must picture the Church as it ought to be (and sometimes, in its local manifestations, actually is), and see what we can do to make it a truer instrument for the Christian revolution. We can best begin by thinking first in terms of a particular local community or congregation, and then, building on what we learn from such considerations, turn to the problem of the Church Universal. What has already been said about the Christian Revolutionary group prepares the way for dealing with this question and gives us the point of view we need.

It will, of course, be clear that I do not use the word Church in a technical or ecclesiastical sense. We need not at this point discuss the right of any particular body of Christians to use the term. I might better use the more clumsy phrase "the Christian Society," but that I wish to claim for the view here stated that it does contain the primitive and essential differentia of the Church; and I am therefore unwilling to surrender the word. Far too long have we concentrated attention on creeds and rites of entrance and claims of precedence or of validity. If it might be given to us to see the Church afresh with the eyes of the first Christians many of the questions that perplex and divide would assume their right proportions and a new meaning would, I believe, be given to the word Church. As a contribution towards such a re-discovery I offer this very partial treatment of a great subject.

* See especially Chapter IV, "The Demand for Adventure," pp. 65-7.

II

Let us begin with the assumption that the Church exists for the purpose of carrying forward the work which Christ came to do on earth. Jesus drew round Himself a few friends who learned more or less what His objects were, and who caught something of His spirit. When He left them there was no other way by which His work could be continued, but just through these personalities and through their corporate witness. Had they failed His work must have been forgotten. This was the early Church. They took their work very seriously. They gave His message fearlessly in spite of great opposition, even though it led many to a martyr's death. They tried to work out His message in individual life and in their relation to one another, even though it meant far-reaching changes in their ideas of private ownership and in other ways. They tried to apply the message to the race problems ; to the relation of employer and employed, to sex questions and so forth. That they were not always successful in seeing just what this amazing new principle of life was to mean in their complex civilisation, and that some of the experiments seem to have failed, should surprise us far less than the courage with which the attempt was made and the degree in which they did succeed in creating quite a new outlook on life.

We may consider the purpose of the life of Jesus under three aspects, revelation, reconciliation and revolution. In each of these the Church was His representative. He brought to men a new idea of God which altered their view of the world and their relations to their neighbours.* His friends, whose lives had been transformed by this revelation felt that they were charged with the high duty of passing it on. Through them and their followers, both within the organised Churches and outside them, this view of God has come

* See *Lay Religion*, Chapter XII, "The Demand for a Knowledge of God."

to be more and more largely recognised and accepted, though we may well doubt if we have fully apprehended its significance. The Church, in its corporate life, should reveal to men what it means to believe in such a God. His presence should be so felt and acknowledged that contact with his Church would awaken men to the reality, the nearness and the love of God.

In the second place Jesus brought men into harmony with God and with their fellows, meeting the fundamental causes of friction and uniting not on the surface but at the heart. If the Church cannot show a real reconciliation within her own borders how can she pass on this message of reconciliation? Can there be any doubt that she is charged with the duty of bringing peace between men and classes and nations. And this peace is not to be the temporary adjustment of rival claims; it is to be a true reconciliation so that a great uniting principle may be discovered and accepted even by those who seem to be irreconcilably divided by national or economic interests. The Church holds, in her thought and should hold in her experience of the uniting purpose of the Father, the key to the ultimate solution of the differences that separate mankind.

The third task which the Church inherits from her Founder is that of bringing about the true revolution. What this is and how it may be brought about we have already considered. Both the other purposes move on inevitably into this. For a view of God such as Jesus revealed to men cannot be taken seriously without revolutionising society; and the problems raised by trying to reconcile are so far-reaching that we soon find that nothing short of a revolution can bring any permanent adjustment. For our present purpose then we may concentrate upon this third aspect of the Church's work, remembering its intimate relation to the other two. What kind of Church is needed to bring in the Christian revolution? What part has she to play locally and in her wider life? How may we help the

Churches we know, and to which many of us belong, to become instruments for this end? These are some of the questions to be faced.

III

The Church, or Christian Society, may be considered in relation to its fellowship, its worship and its work. In each of these departments it should be shaped by the purpose for which it exists. Let us take them separately.

The Fellowship of the Church. It is commonly assumed that one of the great objects to be considered in this connection is the preservation of the purity of the Church. We can only include those who are admitted by a certain rite which is regarded by some as having, in itself, a very deep meaning and potency; all must be morally up to standard and theologically orthodox; the Church must take proper precautions to exclude from her fellowship those who fail in these respects; otherwise her witness will be weakened and she will lose her influence in the world.

It may be doubted whether this whole way of thinking is not dangerous and whether it really corresponds to the primitive conception of the Church. In any case it is open to grave abuse. It tends to a narrow exclusiveness, a judging spirit, a certain priggishness and self-righteousness and a sense on the part of those outside the Church that they can have no lot or part in her life and activities. Let us be perfectly clear at the outset that with every possible precaution the Church cannot be wholly "pure" in this sense, that at the best any outward organisation will only be a rough approximation to the real spiritual family, both because some of its members will not have or will lose the life, and because some who have the life will never find their way into the organisation. This means that over-emphasis on the view just stated leads to a

concentration of effort on what we can never hope to attain.

But it also means that effort is turned into a direction by which even that end cannot be approached. For these outward tests of purity manifestly fail. Very often they frighten away the diffident but sincere spirit, and bring in the shallow or even the insincere. Church history does not seem to show any conspicuous success along these lines, and it shows a number of very conspicuous failures. For the Church herself has martyred and persecuted and excluded as heretics some of her finest children, and given places of high honour to schemers and worse.*

Would it not be possible to use the aim of the Church as the rallying point in place of any credal statement? If the Church exists primarily to bring in the Kingdom of God, why not let her membership be simply those who are engaged in this task? Has any person not so employed any more claim to belong to the fellowship than a civilian to belong to an army in action? The simile suggests, of course, the immense range of activities that may be included as contributing to the main purpose. Just as those engaged in food supply, in coal-mining, in transport and in a hundred other occupations, besides the actual makers of munitions and members of the subsidiary services, are essential to the success of the army in the field, so, in the supreme purpose of the Church, there is need of many others besides the men engaged in direct propaganda. It is in no narrow sense that the thought of unity in a fighting fellowship is brought forward. It should be very widely construed, but even so would it not give a new significance and value to Church membership?

But some will say, how are we to know who are so engaged? Will there not be many who come in on

* Compare especially *The Remnant* in which through heretics and minorities we can trace the true succession of the Spirit.

false pretences? and many who will hesitate to enrol through diffidence? and after all is it any use working for the Kingdom of God unless we have been born again into the family of God? is not this condition the basis on which alone a fighting fellowship can come into existence? and is not this the very purpose of a creed to unite in the essentials of the faith those who, when so united, can work together for this great end?

To answer these questions adequately would carry us far beyond the limits set for this chapter. But this much may be said before we pass on. Suppose the Church in any one centre, were more fearlessly engaged in the task of creating a new social order, suppose it were known to be a body of persons prepared to go all lengths in this endeavour, facing hardship in the life of its members and the fiercest opposition from vested interests, there would be an automatic sifting of its membership and it would inevitably attract the courageous, the idealists, those who were out to join in the creative activities, and just as certainly repel the complacent, the self-righteous, and the indolent. Again such a Church would be forced to develop a deeper religious fellowship, and in the pressure of her great work her devotional life would be deepened, and even those who associated themselves with her having little faith would come to find the need of faith and catch the infection from others who were fired by it. A Church that was thoroughly unpopular because she was so outspoken, and so careless of any conventions which curbed the free spirit of love, would not be a place into which many would run under false pretences. If they did come in falsely the business of the Church would be to win them to a truer spirit, and this would be a far easier task if the individual were in the intimate circle sharing its deepest experience than if he were an outside critic merely judging by appearances.

After all, was it not in some such fashion that the Church first came to be? We read of no tests of membership in the first apostolate, and so little anxious was Jesus

for "the purity of the Church" that He harboured one whom He knew was disloyal still, hoping against hope, it may be, that He might win him into an understanding of His purpose.* The chief thing was that some men and women were drawn into the circle by attachment to the person of Jesus, and were enlisted by Him as partners in His enterprise.

I am not ignoring the importance of a right belief. In my previous volume I have made clear my position on this matter.† The problem is rather how are we to get the right belief, the faith in God that will be creative and dynamic? How are we to have a body of men and women who, by transmitting this faith, are bringing in the Kingdom of God? Credal tests do not seem to have accomplished this. Might not a far greater emphasis on the revolutionary purpose of the Church have a better result even in regard to this very thing? For if the social revolution is to begin with and in the Church, it is clear that the Church herself, and our ideas of what a Church is, need to be revolutionised.

If this line were followed the Church would become the rallying point of all kinds of people. Perhaps there would be many cranks or oddities. But the kind of Church I think of could absorb and use these. It is very certain that social distinctions would have to disappear in the Church, and that alone would mean a first-rate revolution. A Church in whose fellowship there are class differences cannot hope to abolish these in the world; and the same is true of racial differences.

I think of a little town I know where a small group of Christians took their work seriously in the sense in which I am writing. They gathered to their worship a good many rather unpromising people and some who would be called distinctly unorthodox. But they set about facing the problems of wretched slum property, vile and insanitary conditions, immorality, drunkenness,

* Cf. especially the treatment of the career of Judas in *By an Unknown Disciple*.

† *Op. cit.*, pp. 199-201.

the tyranny of the landed gentry. By bringing the facts to light, by fearlessly facing the local interests, by public meetings and by gentle persuasion, this small community produced changes that read like a fairy-tale. A few days ago I received a letter telling me that in this town, once notorious for such cases, there has been no drunkard brought before the bench in three years !

It will be evident that such a Church will place great emphasis upon the possibility of its members working out, each in his own place, the one great uniting purpose. Is anything more needed to-day than a true sense of vocation ? The Church that helps every man, woman and child to relate his own work in the world to the central purpose of the Father is one which the common people will hear gladly.* A Church which has the consciousness of a great mission, not simply among a distant race but also at its doors, will be one that evokes the enthusiasm of its members. And if there be any in the fellowship who do not feel that it is possible for their particular occupation to contribute to the new world order (those who make needless luxuries and harmful things for example) it will be the business of the members of the fellowship to discover ways in which they can change their occupation so that all life, and not only a little extra work done as a hobby, may contribute to the one end.

For the fellowship of the Church must be a real one. Men and women must be so bound together that they will bear one another's burdens. Already there must be seen in the Church the meaning of a true family life where all varieties are included or welcomed, each having its special place of service. To think of the Church as a clique of like-minded persons, all of the same mental colour, is to miss the very highest purpose of the fellowship, the display of that pure white light which needs every colour in the spectrum in order to complete and perfect it.

* See *Lay Religion*, Chapter VII.

It may be objected that it will only be in vary rare cases that any such family spirit can be manifested at all fully in a local community, because the difference of temperament and taste are so great as to make any intimate friendship an impossible achievement in many cases. On the other hand it is quite wonderful what can be accomplished in overcoming just these obstacles to a perfect fellowship when there is a common purpose so strongly moving each as to make the differences almost irrelevant. Anyone who has joined in a great campaign knows how he comes to work gladly with the most surprising colleagues, and discovers even in idiosyncracies that would otherwise repel him a capacity for some aspect of the work which might otherwise be neglected. With the Church, however, the fellowship is much more than devotion to a purpose—it is devotion to a person. Love is the one bond that can deeply unite and hold together the varied personal elements. The Church can never convince the world that she has a message adequate for the needs of society unless she can show its adequacy to hold together her own membership. If love be the dominating factor in the life of the Church, it will not be hard to convince people how desirable it would be were the same to be true of all social groupings. Love to Christ should issue in love to one another expressed in every act and word. It is just because churches so often fail here, that those outside so seldom look to them with any hope. The Church is meant to be the laboratory where love is tested out. What fails in the laboratory will not be applied in the factory.

IV

The Worship of the Church. Perhaps the problems left unsolved in the previous section can only be solved in the common worship which is an essential element in the life of the Christian fellowship. This aspect of the Church's life is also to be considered in relation to

the particular aim, and if we recall the thought that the Kingdom of God is first and foremost a relation of the whole of life to the Father's will, we get a conception of worship that makes clear its vital place. In worship each member of the congregation should be consciously relating his life to God. All his thoughts, plans, occupations, friendships, dreams are brought under review, and their value is tested by their power of contributing to the central purpose of life. There should be in worship such a sense of God's presence that He enters as a partner into all our life, and such an offering of ourselves to Him that we condemn and turn away from anything in our life into which He cannot come. Worship is the adjustment of the private point of view to the world-embracing purpose. Penitence is the acknowledgment of the wrongness of choosing a private aim to the loss of the larger good. Praise is the soul losing itself in recognition of the Father's loving purpose and so true praise merges into dedication of spirit.

United worship has thus a significance of its own. It reminds us of our unity with one another without which worship may become a private luxury leading to a self-centred sentimentalism. It should draw us nearer to one another in sympathy, so that the need of one becomes the burden of all, and the satisfaction of one the joy of all. It should break down the differences between us so that in God's presence we get a new sense of the equal value of each and we can neither be contemptuous nor cringing towards a brother worshipper. We should be led in united worship to a new understanding of God's will, so that our personal and our common problems are solved as we help one another, by the concentration of all minds on the discovery of truth.

It may be freely confessed that worship is often formal and lifeless and so fails to achieve these ends. We get into ruts, and my own feeling is that a liturgy, however beautiful, which is constantly used, cannot

provide for all the needs of united worship. We must admit that there will have to be great varieties in worship. The effort to unite Christians in part by instituting a common form of worship, as was done at the famous Kikuyu Conference, seems to me foredoomed to failure. It may well be that those who do not use any liturgy miss something in reverence, and that for some a liturgical service is a great help to meditation and true worship. The Church that one dreams of would not exclude the use of beautiful words of prayer and praise written by holy men of old. But it would also make possible the use of words springing right out of an immediate experience of the nearness of God to the soul of any worshipper. Silence seems to me an essential element of true worship, partly because it is a medium which unites all without any insincerity in the common search after God, and partly because it gives opportunity for the relating of one's life to God in the presence of others, and for listening to His voice which may bring different messages to each, but which nevertheless will unite all in the consciousness of His presence.* A silence which may be broken under the guidance of the Spirit provides an opportunity for the worshippers to learn through one of themselves as well as direct, and a meeting so held is a remarkable example of the liberty which can be enjoyed by those who are relating themselves consciously to the one guiding will. It has its risks, but much experience of such gatherings leads me to the strong conviction that the risks might with great advantage be taken much more frequently, and that there are some things which can be attained through such worship which can be attained in no other way.

The kind of worship that we need as a preparation for the Church's revolutionary activities should provide

* See "*Silent Worship: The Way of Wonder*, by L. Violet Hodgkin; also *The Fellowship of Silence and the Fruits of Silence*; especially the chapter in the former on "The Surrender of Silence."

for the recognition of our intimate relationship with men and women of all races and creeds and classes. This is found by many in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The essential ideas of this form of worship seem to me to be the actual communion of the human personality with the divine, the use of the commonest things of daily life (our food and drink) as a means towards this end, and the sharing of the privileges of life both outward and inward with all our fellows. Just as we are all one in our need of food and drink, and as our dependence upon these necessities takes away the barriers of rank and race, so in our common need of the divine life there can be no dividing walls. Bound in one common life, members of one family, we have a clear duty to share our goods with all. Perhaps no experience more deeply expresses the essence of this rite in this particular than that of the Quaker saint John Woolman when he was brought "so near the gates of death that he forgot his name." He says of this experience, "I saw a mass of matter of a dull gloomy colour between the south and the east, and was informed that this mass was human beings in as great misery as they could be and live, and that I was mixed with them, and that henceforth I might not consider myself as a distinct and separate being.*" The worship of the Church that is to bring about the Christian Revolution must, either through its sacraments or its silence, or both, contain this element of fellowship with all who suffer and are oppressed, whether for their own fault or not.

Such worship will also help men to see the meaning of their common life in relation to the divine purpose. The idea of throwing aside all week-day thoughts as we enter the Church door must be abandoned. The concerns of home and business are just the things we need to think about in the "house of God." Indeed, it is only as we come to feel that our own homes and shops are also the house of God that the Christian

* John Woolman's *Journal*, New Centy. Edn., 1900, p. 237.

Revolution can begin for us. "If now we could have faith enough to believe that all human life can be filled with divine purpose ; that God saves not only the single soul, but the whole of human life ; that anything which serves to make men healthy and intelligent, happy and good is a service to the Father of men ; that the Kingdom of God is not bounded by the Church, but includes all human relations—then all professions would be hallowed and receive religious dignity."* It is partly for this reason that I have elsewhere advocated a business training for ministers of religion, and it is for this reason that I also feel the very great advantage of a ministry open not only to the professional but also to the lay minister both man and woman. The Church we need must address itself persistently to the task of discovering the divine meaning of the everyday life of her members and helping them to work this out in ever deeper and larger ways. The worship of the Church must reflect her determination to solve this problem. The hour spent in prayer and praise and meditation must be felt to be necessary not only to the culture of a hidden life within the soul, but also to the supreme purpose of Christianising the social order. Worship will be inspired and directed not only by the first great commandment, but also by the second, which is like unto it, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

V

The Work of the Church. The Church which is a community of such persons as we have described and whose worship is of such a character will always be seeking and finding avenues of service. This will not be because she wishes to keep herself before the public or to attract members by social activities, but because her heart burns with a social passion and because some of the problems her members are facing can only be

* Rauschenbusch *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 355.

solved as we move towards their solution together. "Just as the desire to save individuals is now frequently vitiated by the anxiety to increase church membership, so the desire to save social life may be vitiated by the anxiety to keep the Church to the front. Those ecclesiastical bodies which have the strongest church-consciousness are most likely to insist that this work shall be done through them or not at all. . . . This tendency is full of peril not only to the Church but to the social movement itself."*

Often the ideas inspired and originated in the Church may be better worked out in other groups or in the political organisations, but there will be some things that the Church, as such, can do and that no other body can do in the same way. Here again let it be clear that I use the word Church not in the sense of a national or international organisation, but in the sense of a local community of the type we are considering. What I have already said on experiments and on changing the system will give some indication of the kind of way in which the method of the Christian Revolution will be carried out by a Church of this type. Reference may be made to these sections.† Here I propose to give some examples of experiments which seem to need just such a body as a Church, and which have arisen from fellowship in a common purpose and united worship.

The first experiment that springs to one's mind is that of the early Church in its communism. Our data are unfortunately too scanty for us to be able to generalise from this one case. Nevertheless we can say certain things which bear on the problem of our life to-day. It appears as if the first disciples in the light of the transforming experience that came to them at Pentecost adopted what seemed to be the obvious expression of the new spirit. They were a family already, and could not but share their material as well

* *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 348.

† See pp. 92-95 (in Chapter III) and Chapter V.

as their spiritual possessions. "None of them," we are told, "claimed any of his possessions as his own."* The family spirit was felt to be inconsistent with the institution of private property, or at any rate with the wide differences between rich and poor. This communistic experiment would not seem to be the result of any well thought out theory of social rights, but rather the impulsive act of men and women glowing with a new sense of love and mutual responsibility. The strange story of Ananias and Sapphira is only to be understood in the light of this intense sense of social obligation, and the thought that the very existence of the community which was to represent the way of Christ in the world was dependent upon the honest carrying out of the experiment.

It is frequently urged that the experiment failed and that we must therefore abandon the communistic idea in the Church. On the principle of trying to learn by failure as well as by success, we may be justified in a different interpretation of the facts. The appointment of the deacons and the collections made by Paul for the poor in Jerusalem certainly point to some degree of failure. Was this due in part to a reckless carrying out of the plan in the (mistaken) conviction of the Lord's speedy return and the approaching end of the world? Or was it due to a failure to discriminate between different types of property, a too hasty application of an essential truth? Whatever the answer to these questions I think we may say that the early Church was justified in the assumption that the problem of property would have to be dealt with in a radical way if society was to express the family idea. Further, they were surely right in seeking to work this out first in their relations with one another before setting out a programme for a world which had not the family spirit.

There have been very many experiments since then which have had more or less in common with this one.

* Acts iv. 32 (Weymouth).

Francis of Assisi and Robert Owen, to name only two out of a multitude, had each his own way of tackling the problem, and from each such experiment we may learn both what to copy and what to avoid. It need not be assumed that failure spells the real defeat of the idea, for such "failure" may be due to imperfection in the human instrument, or to the concentrated attack of interests or persons whose evil ways are challenged. The way for us to follow is to build again and again out of the ruins of the past, each time hoping for a better result.

The age in which we live is full of such experiments and it may be well to suggest some of the conditions that seem to be required for success. I state them dogmatically for brevity, knowing that some will be challenged.

1. A complete detachment from the present social order is impossible in fact and need not be attempted.

2. The segregation of persons of a very marked type will not work out well, and does not do much to solve the problem.

3. There must be adequate opportunity for the development of individual tastes and convictions.

4. A deep spiritual unity is essential.

5. A mere religious order for preaching, etc., will not go far. The economic problem of production of the necessities of life must be faced on sound principles.

6. No set of rules or conditions or vows will be adequate if the spirit is absent, and they should not be relied upon as a means of creating the community or preserving its character.

7. Differences of all sorts must be dealt with promptly and radically with perfect frankness, and incompatibility of temperament should be recognised rather than allowed to spoil the whole experiment.

Having been in close touch with a number of communistic experiments though never a member of any such group, I feel justified in offering these few suggestions, but I am bound to confess that the

experiments I have watched do not lead me to expect any very marked contribution to the problem of working out the family idea in society through small selected communities. The conditions are too specialised and "artificial" to enable us to argue much from them, or to lead to any general enthusiasm to copy them. I do, however, feel that there is a real value in such experiments and I think a really live and revolutionary Church will always have some persons who feel called to make them, and should give her encouragement, advice and support to them as far as this may be desired or possible.

From these I turn to describe a particular experiment of a somewhat different type which seems to have elements of special value from our point of view. The movement is known as "The Brethren of the Common Table."* It originated with a group of persons belonging to various Christian communions and to widely different walks of life. There were great differences in social status as in actual possessions among the group, but these things did not appear as barriers because they were bound together in the family spirit. They met in a remote part of England for united worship, joining around the Lord's table, and discussing very frankly the relation of the Christian to property. They spent a good deal of time in silent prayer and meditation. The result was described to me as being a kind of "corporate conversion" when they came to a united conviction that they could not share their spiritual wealth without also sharing their material wealth. The Lord's table became, for them, a sign of this sharing of the common things of life. But they did not consider that this new experience involved either the surrender of all private possessions or the holding of anything in common. They "made no vows, but vows were then made for them." They saw in a new way that they could not claim any of their possessions as their own.

* The full statement is given in Appendix B.

The one very simple step that was taken, in this deep sense of fellowship in the presence of Christ, was that each one stated fully and frankly exactly what his financial position was, his possessions, expectations and obligations. This interchange of information was itself a sacrament. It was followed by prayer, each one seeking to know what this new knowledge of his brother's position might mean for him. The conscience of each was quickened, and certain readjustments took place according, as they believed, to the leading of the Spirit in each case. To put this on paper, even, seems to change it from a very vital experience into a mere form. But for those who then met it was a new and very significant expression of the family spirit.

The movement has spread from one to another and different Chapters have been formed. In the appendix the statement issued by the Brethren can be studied in detail. It will be seen that no attempt is made to keep out the "unworthy," a very important point, and that provision may be made for the maintenance of such members of the group as are called to special unremunerative service from time to time. What interests me especially is the working out of the idea among a group or groups whose members are so very different in many ways and who are still living in the present order while seeking to be, through this experiment, creators of a new one. It is also an attempt to carry out within the circle of the Christian family Christ's ideal for a true social order, without making any attempt to regulate life for others. It must proceed by consent if at all.

As I write there comes to my mind a meeting for worship held not many miles from London, and when all minds were turned to the danger of a certain national strike developing into revolution. The meeting was being held after the manner of Friends, and prayer was offered for all parties and for a solution in accordance with the mind of Christ. Among the fifty or sixty worshippers were those whose sympathies were with

the owners, and others who took the side of the strikers. Words were spoken which called us back to the deeper meaning of the strife, the grave issues involved, the thought of our Father's love and His will for His children. When the period of worship came to an end there was a spirit in the meeting that instantly responded to a suggestion that we should remain and discuss the situation. Light seemed to be given as to immediate action, and three persons were asked by the meeting to proceed to the strike headquarters. Negotiations between the parties had broken down. The three persons were able to get into touch with both sides and to keep open the doors which had been officially closed until, within a few days, room was made for a more formal re-opening of negotiations. A small group, under the guidance of the Spirit, had been able to perform a very real service towards bringing peace into a situation where industrial war had already begun. If the Church were more eager to know the divine leading and more sensitive to the needs of the world, would not services of this kind be a common rather than a rare phenomenon ?

Illustrations of the kind of work that would be undertaken by a Church fully convinced of the principles stated in this volume might easily be multiplied. The important point to observe is that such a Church will see the nature of her distinctive contribution as a creative centre and will be prepared to take risks either in supporting her individual members or in corporate experiments. The Church that is chiefly concerned for her own reputation or safety or ease cannot be a pioneer in making the Christian Revolution. The Church that takes this work seriously will develop a strong life of fellowship, a living worship and a programme of activities that will at once arouse interest and lead to both opposition and keen support.

VI

But we cannot consider this topic only in the light of the work of the local group, though that is of prime importance. Unless the local fellowships are warm and active how can we expect the larger organisations to be effective instruments for the Christian Revolution? But if there be no unity in the Church as a whole, how can the efforts of small groups be related and directed to a common end?

The idea of Church Unity seems to me to be centred far too much on organisation, on rites, creeds and external arrangements.* A dis-united Church, one in which the several parts are more or less openly at war with one another, or where there is not a full recognition of one another's position, will not only be weak in face of the evils of the world, but will actually give away her right to speak with power to a divided world. In the fellowship of the Church the world should see the actual possibility of a family life in which differences of race, sex, status are forgotten, where men and women treat one another as brothers and sisters and join in common effort for the good of all. The Church should be a convincing object lesson of the power of love to break down barriers and unite men inwardly. Unless it is this its message of reconciliation and revolution is vain. Herein lies the deeper tragedy of the spectacle of men in different countries proclaiming from Christ's pulpit the righteousness of a war in which the members of His body are using their utmost efforts to destroy one another. However sincere men may be in preaching such a "crusade," the very doing of it takes away from them the right to proclaim a world-wide message of reconciliation. Exactly the same will be true if the pulpits are made the instruments of preaching a class-war, even in self-defence or in a just cause. The

* For further thoughts on Church Unity see two articles by me in *The Pilgrim*, Nos. 2 and 3, being the Olaus Petrie lecture I delivered at Upsala in 1920.

Church's voice should be raised for justice, of course, not only when war threatens, but all the time, and especially in days of peace and plenty, when men sleep comfortably in their beds and forget the gross oppression by which they live at ease. But when the Church proclaims the principles of justice she should also proclaim the way by which justice is to be established in the world—the Way of the Cross—which means that we who believe ourselves to be just are to suffer, not that we are to wreak vengeance on the unjust.

A united Church then, will be able to speak out on grave social evils and to call upon the nations to repent ; she will arouse the public conscience ; she will be fearless of the consequences to herself in loss of prestige and income ; she will be ready to be misunderstood and will fear more when all men speak well of her than when she is persecuted as her Master was. When the Pittsburg capitalists withdrew their support from the Young Women's Christian Association on account of its fearless social programme, they were doing what would be constantly done by various groups if the Church were united in her passion against social injustice. Nothing would unite the Christian bodies in a more splendid unity than a campaign of fearless exposure of evil that opened all alike to bitter attacks and left all in financial difficulties. This is the path toward Church unity that seems to me full of real hope. Dare we take it ?

If the Church of to-day were to see again what the early Church saw, that all war is contrary to the spirit and teaching of Christ, and that as Christians we could not fight in any cause, however just,* no doubt there would be intense opposition, no doubt many members would fall away, very likely there would be imprisonment and death for many as in the late war for the

* See Dr. C. J. Cadoux's exposition of this fact in *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, of which Professor Harnack writes : " On the strength of your work one might say ' The case is settled.' "

Conscientious Objectors, but the Church would at once be seen to take the moral leadership of the world, she would be able to bring war to an end in a very short time, and she would be so drawn together in a unity of conviction and suffering—she would so demonstrate the meaning of the unity of mankind in one family, that differences of credal statement and church polity would seem in the eyes of men generally as a very small thing. There would be a true sense of proportion which is what we need more than anything else if we are to get away from the type of religious controversy that so often absorbs our thoughts and weakens our witness for Christ.

In some such ways as those just indicated, then, the Church needs to be united as a missionary church with a universal message touching all life's problems and embracing all peoples. The Church Universal would come to have a new significance, and even those who could not accept her creeds would join with her in her revolutionary activities.

But it is more than enthusiasm, even for suffering and death, that the Church needs. She needs knowledge. One of the first things to be planned by a Church that took her task seriously would be a research department. She would devote her best brains and large resources not to training men so that they could deliver moving sermons or write able treatises on theology alone, but to close examination into the actual facts of our contemporary life, the problems that need to be solved in our big cities, in industry, in agriculture, in international life and so forth. Into such a research department would be turned the actual experience of Church members the world over who were trying to face their problems in the Christian spirit; they would bring their difficulties and successes; they would show why business is not being conducted according to the Golden Rule and what are the real seeds of war. From such a research department would flow papers and books that would help towards clear thinking;

suggestions for action by local congregations or groups of congregations ; advice to individuals and information about those who were facing similar problems ; plans for intervisitation from country to country, school to school, town to town. What object of research can be more worthy of effort than research into the problem of making this earth a place where God's will is done as in heaven, and into the many noble efforts being made towards this end? Such a department spread in various countries would command the support of the very best brains the Churches in all lands could produce. If it were taken seriously it would enlist many students who are burning with a desire to harness their energies to a worthy task. It should be linked with the world-wide missionary movement already referred to, and it should be producing missionaries of the new social order, for many who began with research would wish to go on into active service, coming back perhaps, with richer experience to give further years to the work of investigation.

Probably such a department would have to begin with one or two specific problems such as some of those considered in the next chapter. Too ambitious a scheme might simply lead to failure. There is nothing to be gained by spreading one's efforts over a huge field before one has learned the art of cultivating a small part of it. It may be that the first point of attack should be international relations, simply because the danger there is so great and all the causes of progress are threatened by the possibility of another world war. But if such an enterprise could be begun by a combination of the Churches, if it were fearless in its approach to social wrong, if its proposals were not turned down the minute they threatened the subscription lists to church funds, it might have a far-reaching influence upon the life of the world.

Let me give one illustration of the kind of thing to which I refer. During the last ten years the political tension between China and Japan has been very acute,

and the feeling of resentment in China towards Japan has infected the Church to a very serious extent, Feeling strongly that the Church has a unique duty in this matter, I was able to gather together a small group of Christians from both countries in order to face the issues with perfect frankness. All the chief sections of the Protestant Church were represented. A large part of the time was spent in prayer and silent waiting upon God. The point of view of each country was very frankly stated. After a week's work certain lines of effort were seen to be possible and a beginning, even though a small one, was made in dealing with some of the causes. Only the future can show where this may lead. The chief point is that it was possible in the atmosphere of Christian love to bring together those who differed intensely, and to begin a research into these difficult matters with mutual confidence. Where feelings are very strong it is often impossible to secure the atmosphere in which alone patient research can be undertaken with all points of view considered. The Church should be able to provide this atmosphere.

However the end is to be reached it is quite clear to me that the Church needs more information, better thinking and more courageous action if it is to be worthy of a place in the programme of revolution, and if it is to be an advantage to humanity for it to be united at all. But after all it is the Church, in its real essence, that is designed to be the pioneer of the Christian revolution. It ought to contain just those men and women who are prepared to take this way ; its fellowship ought to be the deep and enduring one that will stand the strains on loyalty that are sure to come in such an enterprise ; it is essentially international and is already in point of fact inclusive of men and women of all races ; it places service before profit ; it preaches love as the supreme force for its God is love ; it holds that to lose life is to gain it, and that with God all things are possible ; it claims to have as the very centre of its life and worship a risen Lord, Leader and Saviour

whose life can and does possess it and give it assurance of ultimate triumph.

If the Church, then, is not the body through which the Christian Revolution is to come, where can we look for another? What is its own claim to our support and fealty? Christ said to His disciples "Ye are the salt of the earth." Has the salt lost its savour? If so it is only fit to be cast out and trodden under the foot of men. If that should happen another Church would have to arise out of the ashes of the old, purified by fire, passionate for truth and righteousness, aflame with pure love. Let us hope that this Church which exists in the world, which has handed on the divine message, which has produced many noble individuals and many revolutionary groups, which has done not a little to make our common life purer and kinder, may have in it the seeds of its own rebirth or may be the soil in which these seeds can spring up as they are cast by the Divine Sower! This is my hope—a hope that sometimes burns very low as during the late war, or when I look only at official pronouncements or the tomes of controversial writings. Yet when I look at the lives of many whom I know humbly toiling for a better world, when I enter many homes which are the centre of a deep love and creators of strong characters, when I worship in all parts of the world with groups of simple-minded folk who have looked upon the face of Christ and been made new in Him, the hope springs up again; and I begin to see that not in outward signs, but in inward life God is still in her midst—she shall not be moved.

But it does seem as if the testing of the Church were at hand. Will she be able to meet the test? When the Son of Man cometh shall He find faith? Will it again be, however He is to be revealed to our generation, that the wise and prudent, the leaders and organisers will many of them miss the marks of His appearing? Will it be that once again out of the obscure peasants, and the despised profiteers, and the ranting agitators

He will gather to Himself those who can be sent forth as the Apostles of a new social order to turn the world upside down? Will He weep again over the most privileged, the respectable, the leaders of the people and even of the Churches as over the privileged city when He said, "If thou hadst known in this day, even thou, the things which belong unto peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes."*

The Church has a revolutionary message. No other body has one that can compare with it. There is nothing wrong with the message: It is the messenger who is at fault. She has not accepted the message herself. This is why her message does not seem to be relevant to the things men are thinking about to-day. She is not working out in her own life the revolution she still preaches. When she begins again to do this she will become the most relevant and creative force in the modern world.

*Luke xix. 42.

CHAPTER IX
THE WORLD OF INDUSTRY

The fact that we live on the same planet and are dependent on each other through the division of labour, is not nearly sufficient to unite us inwardly, and instil into us genuine sympathy and love for one another. To this end man must be lifted up; there must be an inrush of new power. Only a life which includes us all, root and branch, and melts down all rigid distinctions, can produce genuine humanity, kindness, sympathy and love, not as passing emotions of a merely subjective mood, but as mighty currents flowing from within, making every man feel with his fellow, sorrow and rejoice with him, assimilate his life directly to his own.

PROFESSOR EUCKEN.

CHAPTER IX

THE WORLD OF INDUSTRY

I

FOR multitudes the economic system in which we live is the sternest and most unyielding of realities. It appears more terrible than nature, more relentless than Fate. It touches, it grips all their life. It is inescapable and omnipotent. We need never feel surprise that the doctrine of economic determinism has appealed to very many ; it so obviously fits the facts of which they are most acutely conscious. Caught in a system that gives them scarcely any power of self-determination, that demands their unremitting labour, that prevents them from educating their children as they would wish, that decides on the homes they should live in, that gives little if any security or leisure, that discards them ruthlessly when they fall by the way, can we wonder that the workers of the world unite in desperation, and are a fit ground for the sowing of revolutionary seeds ? The real wonder is that there is so much patience and good sense and goodwill among those whom the system seems designed to enslave and crush.

When, nevertheless, we stop to consider this wonderful economic organisation which we usually take for granted without a thought, we cannot fail to be impressed and even awed by its complexity, the interrelation of its parts, its hold upon the lives of men all over the world. Think what has gone into the making of the things we eat or wear on any one day ; trace them back through shop, middleman, factory to farm or mine or forest ; remember all that has gone to the building of the factories, the making of the machines, the

creation of credit systems, the development of transport ; fill the whole with persons, tens of thousands who have contributed to our welfare on this one day, and one must take off one's shoes for one is standing on ground that is made holy by the human toil and sweat of a great army.

Looked at from one point of view the system is a terrible colossus, a Juggernaut crushing its countless unwilling devotees : looked at from another it is a marvel of men's skill and ingenuity, a token of his God-given powers of organisation and co-operation. Which is right ?

I suppose we are bound to admit that each aspect is a true one. While at one moment we wish to change the whole system, to destroy it, if possible, in a day, at another we tremble to touch it lest our interference may bring it all down about our ears in terrible confusion, and we may even prove to be fighting against God. While many are oppressed and while grave evils are indeed imbedded in the system which has grown up we scarcely know how, it is also true that the lives of all of us depend upon it, and any rash interference with it may produce misery and even starvation to numbers of our fellows, witness the present condition of Europe.

The position which we have taken up in this volume is that of a frank recognition of the evils of modern industrialism and of the economic system. We have not spent long in examining them, assuming a sufficient knowledge of them on the part of all. Are these evils inevitable ? Are there " economic laws " which we cannot evade, and which condemn us to accept casual labour and unemployment, overcrowding in big cities, sweating in certain industries, child-labour in others, or a division of human society into two groups never very far from meeting one another in the " class-war ? " The idea that we are in the grip of a system we cannot control, or bound by laws we cannot transcend has long enough held sway, and is beginning

to yield to the saner view which recognises that any system is but the creation of human wills, and that what man has made he can unmake if he so desire, or if he desire it enough. Needless to say we take this latter view as the basis of our discussion and turn at once to the problem of how the goodwill of men may be made effective in producing the desired change.

Not for a moment would I deny the value of laws in improving conditions, raising wages, establishing tribunals, abolishing child-labour and in many other ways rendering the industrial system more endurable. But this is not the place in which to discuss social legislation. What we are here considering is the work of the Christian revolutionary in creating a better social order. He is not content with restraining evil important as that is. Laws are a fit way by which men help to "keep themselves up to scratch," they are necessary as long as there is so much weakness and sin in human nature, and even those who make them often themselves feel the need of them in order to strengthen their impulses toward good. Our concern here, however, is to see how something more can be done than any law can achieve, how we may enter into the promised land in the great sphere of industry.

II

Wherever creative work is to be done which is of real value we need to have a clear idea of the end in view. No doubt it is peculiarly difficult, in regard to so complex a matter as our industrial system, to define in any detail the end which is really consistent with the principles of Christ, and towards which the Christian revolutionary should move. Nevertheless the effort should be made, and we may be confident that as we seriously attempt to move towards the end we shall discern it more clearly. It is not very difficult to lay down certain general principles which would be accepted by most of those who are concerned to bring

in a new social order. There must be a full recognition of the absolute worth of each individual, and it must be clearly seen that personal values always rank higher than material ones; the aim should be to enlist the altruistic rather than the self-regarding impulses in the production of wealth, so that men work for the good of the community rather than for private gain: all industry should cultivate and develop human fellowship among all concerned and reforms should be carried out through united effort even where much patience has to be exercised: all should recognise and the system should express the principle of a relation between advantages received and service rendered, so that none receive an income without fulfilling some function in the community: it should be possible for men to work as members of a family in co-operation with one another, and competition should have a subordinate and not a controlling influence in industry.*

To put down a few guiding principles is much easier than to see how they would work out. The effort to apply them should be made by the combined thought of representatives of all concerned. The Church, or the Christian revolutionary group, should contain the varied elements, labour, management, capital, consumer. It should be working continually at the problem of what these principles would mean if actually carried out in our industrial life. Whenever, in one more or less restricted sphere, it becomes apparent that such and such a result would follow it should be the aim of the group, without delay, to find means for putting this particular plan into effect. In some cases it may involve an individual experiment by one person who is in control of some industry. In other cases

* Since these words were written the so-called "Open Forum" on social questions, held at the Peking Conference of the World's Student Christian Federation, has passed some findings which are specially significant as giving expression to an agreement among Christians of many nations and creeds. Perhaps they are the first of many attempts to reach the mind of Christ *internationally* on these matters, and because of that hope I give them in Appendix C.

it may require a group to act together in initiating some scheme. In other cases it may call for the attempt to carry out plans on a wide scale calling upon the best elements in a large circle even in the whole nation to unite in trying a new path. Examples of these different methods will be given later. What I want to do here is to urge that the value of any experiment is to be judged by the ultimate aim, the direction of movement more than by the effects immediately obtainable. The aim is such a radical change in the whole system of industry as shall make it a true expression of the principles stated above.

Now such a change seems to me to involve at any rate the following elements :

(1) An altogether different idea of the "rights" of property. A certain amount of private ownership seems to me to be necessary and advisable. That which a man needs for his own use and for that of those dependent upon him should be his own. It is also to the advantage of the community that he should be protected in the use of that which he needs in order to render his proper service to the community. In modern industrial production this must usually mean not actual individual ownership, but either ownership by the community which protects the worker in the use of the means of production, or ownership in common by all those engaged in that particular factory, workshop, farm or what not. In any case the ownership of what others use and what we ourselves cannot and do not use for any service to the community seems to me to be without justification. That which gives me power to control the lives of others, or which enables me to live in ease on the labour of others, I do not believe I have any inherent right to, whatever may be the laws of the country.*

* Perhaps the best recent statement of this point of view is to be found in R. H. Tawney's *Acquisitive Society*, which I should strongly recommend to any readers who may not know it. See also Prof. Hobhouse's division between property for use and property for power, in *Property, Its Duties and Rights*, and elsewhere.

To carry out this idea fully would mean a very drastic revision of the laws of inheritance, a completely new idea of land ownership (perhaps single-tax or ownership by the community in some form), common ownership of essential industries and transport, at any rate the strict limitation of interest on capital if not complete abolition, and a number of other far-reaching changes.

(2) *A new method of carrying on industry, whereby the wage system would be abolished, and capitalist (if the class remains at all in some modified way) manager, labourer and consumer would be bound into a co-operative group.* The wage-system seems to involve something short of the full recognition of the equal rights of all—at any rate in its present form. One man by offering another a wage buys his labour, and having used it can sell the result of it at such price as he thinks fit or can command; he has also the power largely to determine the conditions under which that labour is performed, though this is of course curtailed in most States by law, by the public conscience and by the power of organised labour; he has also the power to discharge the worker and so the good of one man and his family are dependent on the will of another, and also upon market fluctuations and other incalculable factors.

If the principles we have stated are to be applied in any thorough way they demand a change in this system in order that men may really meet one another on even terms, and that those who work may be able to feel that their work is truly a vocation—a service rendered to the community, and not merely toil for their own bread and butter, and beyond that for the enrichment of some other person or persons. The community as a whole should gain by the labour of the community, and should be responsible to see that individuals do not suffer when conditions alter: that is to say the surplus profits of industry and the increment of land values should add to the general well-being and not increase private fortunes; and the unemployment

that comes through changes in demand and other general causes should be met by and be a burden on all and not only on the few who are thrown out of work.

(3) *Production for use and not for profit.* The capitalist system with unlimited competition and advertisement means the production of just those things which can be sold to advantage. In many cases these things are not really needed by the community or by individuals. But there are people who have enough money to buy them and therefore they are produced. John Woolman long ago saw that over-production, *i.e.*, luxury, meant oppression. There is at the other end of the scale a large number of persons unable to secure things they absolutely need for bodily or mental development. These things are not being made, not because there are not materials out of which to make them, or persons who could do so, but simply because it does not "pay" anyone to make them, or because it pays better to make something else. This is the reason why the use of luxuries is really a sin against society.

The above remarks may seem to be little more than the platitudes of modern social thinkers. I have given them as indications of what seems to me to be involved in the Christian revolution, not of course, as an exhaustive statement of a vast problem, but only to indicate how very far the principles carry us. They certainly involve a new industrial revolution, not on the principle of *laissez faire* but rather on that of *noblesse oblige*. If we take it that some such reconstruction of our industrial system is not only desirable but essential, if it is to have permanence and true worth, we have to ask ourselves how it can be brought about. What is the method of the Christian Revolution in relation to this complex problem? Is there any hope of a solution short of open warfare between the property-owning, wage-paying classes on the one hand and the wage-earners on the other? How much depends on the answer to this question it is impossible to say.

III

Let it be clear that our object in thinking out our principles and trying to visualise the result of applying them is not to inaugurate legislation that may embody the vision. It is to have a standard whereby to test the value of any experiment made, to help to direct our thoughts towards such experiments as will be in the line of true progress and generally to stimulate thought, conviction and endeavour towards the achieving of the ends discerned. It seems clear enough that most of the world is not yet ready for the drastic changes indicated in the previous section, and those who are ready for them or even eager for them are generally inclined to use methods of violence in effecting them. There is need of an ever-growing body of persons who see the desirability and necessity of such changes, who are ready to pay the price of getting them, and who see clearly what price will actually deliver the goods. The Christian revolutionary believes that he has seen these things and he is one whose life is committed to the task of realising the ideal.

We need then to remind ourselves again of the fact that mere outward changes are not going to make the world like a family, and that what is needed is some method whereby the family spirit will grow along with the alteration in society, if our economic organisation is to be an expression of that spirit. Herein lies the importance of the kind of work recorded in the cases that are here collected. These are not, of course, anything but a few typical ways in which the islands are being created out of which the new continent may yet be formed. The important point is not the degree of success or failure attaching to the experiment, nor even the extent to which it actually conforms to the principles laid down. It is rather that those concerned have honestly tried to apply these principles, that they have dared to take the risks involved in doing so, and that they have found some measure of response

in others, perhaps beyond what most people would anticipate.

One of the most recent experiments in trying to carry out the principles of Jesus Christ, in a particular factory seems to be that of the A. Nash Company, of Cincinnati.*

I use it as one illustration out of many that might be taken. In this case the concern was controlled by one family which no doubt made it easier to carry out the plan. But the main outlines of the story must convince anyone that, quite apart from special conditions, there was something in the method possible of far wider application. Shortly after the close of the war, Mr. Nash became the owner of a small factory for producing ready-made clothes. He found the conditions bad and the wages which were being paid entirely insufficient. He determined, without more ado, to apply the Golden Rule, as far as he could see what it meant, literally even if it meant going out of business. After reaching this decision he called the workers together and told them what he was going to do and why. It meant, for example, that some of them would at once receive three times the wage they had been having.

He says "I made no promise about the business lasting; but I told my people that so long as the business continued I was going to try honestly to apply the Golden Rule.

* Since writing the following paragraphs I have read the article in the *Survey* of 18 March, 1922, in which S. Adele Shaw gives another view of this piece of work. In regard to some of the points raised I imagine there is an explanation which may present things in a better light. I cannot, however, escape the conviction that Mr. Nash has been too quick in proclaiming the success of his experiment, and too ready to leave its working out in the hands of others who did not share his spirit, while he propagated the idea. I leave this example in my book in spite of the article referred to, partly because there seems to remain enough of value to serve as an illustration, and also in the hope that the experimenter may take note of the criticism, and boldly deal with what remains to be dealt with in the spirit which he seems to have shown at the outset of his effort. This is practically the only experiment of which I have not some direct knowledge, and I am sorry indeed to find that it cannot support all that I had hoped to get from it.

There was a buzz of interest as I walked away. Some of the workers seemed bewildered. They talked it all over.

“ Darned if I don't believe he means it ! ” exclaimed the little Italian presser, “ Let's get busy ! ”

One result of the change was that the people turned out nearly three times as much clothing as ever before. Through two years of very severe strain in the industry when there were many strikes and serious depression this concern was carried on without a single strike and so greatly increased its business that in the month of June, 1920, it turned out more than in the whole of the year 1918. The employees came to the firm at one period of unemployment and volunteered to take an entire month off work in order that some of the unemployed in the city might find work. A profit-sharing system on a generous scale was introduced, and the profits were to be distributed on the basis of salaries earned. Some days after the scheme had been announced the firm received a document of which the following extract gives the main purport :

“ Realising that the A. Nash Company is using every effort to be truly just and democratic, and realising that in making the final adjustment of wages on the profit-sharing basis, a very large part of this final payment, as at present intended, would go to those making big wages . . . we, the undersigned, all of whom are drawing a weekly wage of over sixty dollars, do hereby petition the management to distribute the workers' share of profits on the basis of time worked instead of on the basis of wages drawn.”

By this request all those signing stood to lose. Some would have received six or seven times as large a return as the poorer paid workers. But the spirit of the Golden Rule had so gripped the entire staff that they came forward to get the scheme altered in favour of others and to their own loss.

At the same time the price of the goods was being

steadily reduced in order that no unfair profit might be made at the expense of the consumer.

The above is only a brief summary of a story that reads like a romance. The results are directly traced to the determination at all costs to try out the principles of Jesus Christ even though it seemed certain they would be financially disastrous. The result was not only a financial success but a new spirit—the family spirit—in the entire factory. It showed the creative power of love for making a new kind of society.

I am well aware that this experiment is open to criticism from the point of view of those who hold, as I do, that the full acceptance of the way of Christ means a complete alteration of the wage-system. Profit-sharing, for example, is no final solution of our problem. But the outstanding facts are these that a man did what he saw to be needed in a certain direction although it seemed certain to lead to bankruptcy, and that such action did do the most important thing, it introduced the new spirit without which any change of the system will be barren. I do not suppose that the experiment will stop at this point. But even if it does its lessons are so obvious and important that they may well be taken to heart even by those who most firmly hold that nothing short of a new economic organisation will meet the situation.*

In his recent book, *The Human Factor in Industry*, B. Seebohm Rowntree has given ample material for the student to see how similar principles have been applied in a very different industry. In the Cocoa Works at York we have an example of what might almost be called the last word in enlightened and altruistic management of a great industrial enterprise. The fear of insecurity, which is so terrible a part of many a labourer's lot, is boldly dealt with in a number of schemes for unemployment insurance, sickness

* The quotations are taken from *The American Magazine*, October, 1922, further details are given in a special pamphlet on this experiment.

benefits, pensions, widows' allowances and death benefits. To all of these the firm has contributed liberally. Hours of work have been so fixed that there are only five working days ; full wages are paid for all public holidays and for a week's complete rest in the summer ; medical services, baths, decoration of rooms, cricket and football grounds, and many other provisions are made for the health and enjoyment of the employees. The internal conditions are largely determined by works' councils on which the various grades of workers are fully represented. To read such a volume makes one feel that the conditions of life in the factory must be little short of ideal. It illustrates again how much is possible within the capitalistic system where the spirit of Christ controls the capitalist and a determined effort is made to carry out His principles. Certainly we have here again an example of how the family spirit can be brought into a factory—a spirit which must, one feels, work itself out, in course of time, to even more fundamental changes than those which have so far been introduced.*

It is not my purpose in this volume to make any exhaustive study of the very many experiments of this kind that have been made. I have chosen two which are alike in this that they are prompted by the desire to express the principles of Jesus in the actual operation of modern industry, that they are only a partial solution of the problems, but that they have been successful in creating a new spirit, and the risks taken have not involved financial disaster. Both efforts leave one with many unanswered questions. Is this method calculated to develop real independence of thought and action in the workers ? Do not the results of good ownership leave one with an added conviction of the possibilities of bad ownership ? If so much depends on the spirit of those who control the lives of others is it really right that so much control should be in the hands of the few ? If the ideas that have

* *The Human Factor in Industry*, Longmans, Green & Co., 6s.

achieved such notable results are carried further whereunto will they grow? These experiments stand out brilliantly against the many cases of the unsocial use of economic power. Take an extract from a trade journal about a Shanghai cotton mill and compare it with these examples.

“The profits of the . . . Cotton-spinning Factory again surpassed \$1,000,000. To those who bestow thought on the progress of textile industries in China, the following particulars regarding this concern may be of interest. The company was started in 1904 with a paid up capital of \$600,000 divided into 6,000 shares of \$100 each. The capital was increased to \$900,000 in 1916. For the past two years it has been running day and night with scarcely any intermission. The number of hands employed is 2,500 and the following is the wage table per day :

	Minimum.	Maximum.
Skilled Labour (<i>e.g.</i> Foremen) :		
Men	35 cents (Mex.)*	60 cents
Women	30 „	50 „
Ordinary labour :		
Men	30 „	50 „
Women	20 „	30 „
Boys (aged about 15)	20 „	30 „
Girls „ „ „	10 „	20 „
Small boys (aged about 10)	10 „	20 „
Small girls „ „ „	7 „	10 „

The working hours are from 5.30 a.m. to 5.30 p.m. and from 5.30 p.m. to 5.30 a.m. respectively. No meals are supplied by the factory. Most of the cotton used is produced locally, and the factory is able to turn out about 7,000 piculs monthly of coarse yarn, chiefly No. 10. It will be seen that the company is in an exceptionally favourable position. With the raw material at their doors, an abundant and absurdly cheap labour supply to draw on, and no vexatious

* The cent (Mex.) varied in value during the period from say $\frac{1}{2}$ d. to $\frac{1}{3}$ d.

factory laws to observe, it is not surprising that their annual profits have exceeded their total capital on at least three occasions."

No it is not surprising! But it ought to fill every shareholder with unutterable shame. This is, of course, in a place where public opinion and labour organisation have scarcely begun to operate and where there is no legislation to put a check on the system. This is the other side of the picture, and shows that experiments are not confined to those who have good intentions. Can a system in which such things are possible be an expression of Christ's spirit in Society? This example gives us an "exceptionally favourable" opportunity for answering such a question. It is a contemplation of such a background that leads one, while greatly welcoming such efforts as those described, and recognising how greatly the promoters of them are contributing to the discovery of still further possibilities of social betterment, to turn from them in search for some more drastic way of dealing with the situation. Is the method of the Christian Revolution inapplicable in this wider and more difficult field?

IV

The first direction in which we should look for action is in the voluntary relinquishment of power by those who possess it, that is to say of the power which comes through possession. In the present order it is often very difficult to see how to surrender wealth in any constructive way so that it will not simply pass from the hands of one capitalist (who may be socially-minded) into the hands of another (who may be anti-social in his use of it). There are some ways however by which the power over the lives of others that great wealth ordinarily brings may be voluntarily surrendered. Investment in a guild, such as one of those shortly to be described, or in a concern which is carried on as a trust and only grants interest at a limited

rate, such as some of the Garden City Trusts and the recently formed Empire Development Trust will give some relief, by spontaneous action, to those whose legal rights are beyond what they conceive to be their moral ones. Such investment will strengthen the enterprises which are designed to work for public welfare rather than for private profit, and will therefore be a real step towards the revolutionary changes we are thinking of.

An illustration of a more definite step of the same kind may be given in what is known as the "Shareholders' Movement." This arose during the Railway Strike in England in October, 1919, when a small group of men and women who owned railway shares felt that they could not conscientiously receive dividends while the wages paid to any of the employees of the company were really inadequate. Recognising that in the last resort it is the demand of shareholders for dividends that determines the policy of public companies in matters of wages and conditions of labour they joined in the issue of the following statement:—

"We, the undersigned, being Shareholders or Beneficiaries through shares in Companies, wish to state publicly that we are convinced that the claims of the workers to wages making it possible for them to live a full and free life, come before the claims of Shareholders to Dividends. We will therefore support such a re-organisation of the present Industrial System as shall bring about the highest good of the workers and the best interests of the community, and are prepared to accept whatever personal loss shall arise through such re-organisation."

I cannot judge how wide the effect of this action has been, but I quote it as a serious attempt to apply the teachings of Christ to a specific problem. Some who joined in this movement were largely if not wholly dependent on interest from investments, and they well knew that their entire income from these sources was jeopardised by their action. They believed this

was the Christian course to take, and the movement has been working to try and bring pressure to bear upon directors in order to make an adequate return to labour, a first charge on industry whatever the effects on capitalists may be.*

A not dissimilar effort is the recently formed National Movement Toward a Christian Order of Industry and Commerce. This movement began among a few people who were determined to apply Christian principles in their own businesses, and who, in seeking to discover what such application would mean, discussed the problem with advanced labour leaders. After several such conferences a statement was drawn up which contains the following points :—

“ (1) The governing motive and regulative principle of all industry and commerce should be service of the community.

“ (2) The receipt of an income lays on the individual the duty of rendering service in accordance with his capacity. Every person should perform the best possible work.

“ (3) The receipt of an income from industry should carry with it a responsibility for the conditions and purpose of the industry.

“ (4) Any competition should be subordinated to the service of the community.

“ (5) Industry should create and develop human fellowship, and any practices calculated to destroy such fellowship are immoral.

“ (6) The value of all natural resources and of every privilege which owes its worth to the labour of all or to the necessities of all should be held and utilised for the benefit of all.

“ (7) Every individual man and woman is of intrinsic worth and human labour cannot be regarded as a commodity.”

* For several striking instances of what shareholders have done and tried to do in the direction indicated, see *The Church and Industrial Reconstruction*, pp. 197-9.

How far these principles are going to be applied by members of the movement it is too soon to say. They may seem to some a rather halting statement of a social creed. But they contain enough dynamite to blow up a great deal of the present system if they are fearlessly applied, and they contain, which is far more significant, a good deal of material for the building of a better one. At least it is a hopeful sign that here are two movements that have originated in the possessing classes, that are a definite attempt in the direction of a real reconstruction of the social order and that are certainly contributing towards the preparation of people's minds for comprehensive changes in our economic organisation. Other illustrations of the same kind of thing may be given in the recent Anglican pronouncements, those of the Archbishop's Committee and the Pan-Anglican Conference, the report of the Church and Industrial Reconstruction issued by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and the statement of policy of the Young Women's Christian Association in America that caused such an outcry among the capitalists of Pittsburg.

From these statements which have yet to be embodied in action we turn to the actual achievements in the Building Industry in England. This story is told in the volume published by the Garton Foundation. *The Industrial Council for the Building Industry*, and also in brief in one of the volumes of this series.*

The birth of the movement was in a little room in London where a few persons, inspired by the belief that there is a Christian way for human society, prayerfully sought to discover what that way might be for one particular industry. When the war broke out the long drawn-out struggle between employers and employed was on the point of reaching a climax. A lock-out throughout the country had actually been decided upon and was to take effect on the 15th of August,

* *Man and His Buildings*, by T. S. Attlee, pp. 166-173.

1914. The war intervened, and a respite was given. The opportunity was seized by some who believed in a revolutionary handling of the situation. A scheme which appealed with the utmost boldness to the better instincts of men and masters was drawn up. It was based on the conviction that public spirit and constructive goodwill would prove stronger forces than private-mindedness and class interest. All concerned in the industry were to come together to consider how it might be made a more efficient public service and not to try to settle disputes. Voting was to be not in sections, labour against capital, but each man according to his convictions. It was to be assumed that the deepest interest of all concerned in the industry was to make it efficient and to carry it forward in peace. To a works' foreman who saw it the proposal seemed so impossible that he said, "The scheme is all right, but the Unions are not at all likely to consider it. They will probably put it into the waste-paper basket, and tell you to mind your own business."

What actually happened was this. The scheme was launched on 8th March, 1916, in a letter to the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners. In a week it had captured the London District Committee, in a month the National Executive. Six months later the delegates of the twelve principal Trade Unions in the Industry adopted it without a single dissident. In June, 1917, it was adopted by the National Federation of Building Trades Employers of Great Britain, and the National Council was opened in May, 1918, with the support of twenty-three Trade Unions and seventeen Associations of Employers.

Consideration of space forbids a more extended reference to what seems to me one of the finest examples of the way in which the method of the Christian Revolution can actually work. Let me note the important points. The scheme had its birth in a deliberate attempt through prayer and frank discussion to apply the principles of Christ to a very difficult practical

problem. It was frankly idealist, appealing to the best in all, and not diluting its idealism because of the "hardness of men's hearts." It deals in a thorough-going way with the system, was always recognised as a step toward real self-government and has actually been a step towards the formation of several Building Guilds. It received the support of hard-headed men of business in all camps, and that without any legislation; it was a purely voluntary effort from first to last. Those who knew the situation well were the most astonished at the rapid—one might almost say miraculous—success that the plan achieved.

Whether this particular plan is all that its enthusiastic supporters claim for it or not, how far it may have missed doing the best that was hoped I am not, writing at a distance, able to say. But no failure to achieve its ends can deprive this little piece of industrial history of its profound significance. Writing on the report of one of its committees in the *Manchester Guardian*, R. H. Tawney used these words: "It will be seen that it involves a drastic breach with the industrial traditions of the last century. It involves the limitation of interest, the conversion of the employer from a profit-maker into a manager remunerated by a fixed salary, publicity, as to costs and profits, the maintenance of the workers during times of unemployment, the responsibility of the whole industry for the standards obtaining among the firms composing it, and an effective share by the workmen in responsibility for its conduct."

It is only natural that this experiment should have led on to the establishment of various Building Guilds. These again are experiments toward a new social order. Not, it may be, consciously trying to express the Christian ideal, they are nevertheless adventures of the spirit and they call for the "team spirit" or the family spirit if they are to be in any way successful. The Guild, says the prospectus of one of them, "boldly challenges the industrial traditions of a century, and

makes its appeal solely to the best instincts and creative impulses of men.”* Already the movement has assumed national importance. On their contracts “all forms of profit have been completely eliminated. The Guilds are building directly for the public, and their first concern is to render the public the most efficient national service.† If this is not of the essence of Christianity I do not know what is. I welcome these not only for their own sake but because I see in them the very kind of experiment which it seems to me is characteristic of the Christian way of advance.

It is, of course, impossible in a few lines to deal with the question of Guild Socialism. But it does seem important to point out the relation of the far-reaching proposals included under that term to the main thesis of this book. No mere re-organisation of society can produce the family spirit; this we have repeatedly urged and it is recognised by all clear-sighted social reformers. But some forms of social organisation can be made the expression of the family spirit and some, it seems to me, cannot in any really adequate way.

Our present social order is not adapted to a society in which men really put service before gain and brotherly love before personal advantage. I believe the ideals of Guild Socialism are the nearest we have yet got to making concrete the kind of society that would be a fit vehicle for the Christian spirit. It may well be that, as further experiments are made, changes in the details will prove necessary. It is certain that any courageous effort to put these ideals into practice will lead to an enlargement of our vision as well as to a quickening of our hope.

One thing I regret, and that is the tendency to insist, in some Guild socialist writing, upon the necessity of applying force in order to carry out the ideal. I

* *An Industry Cleared for Action*, from the National Guilds League, 1d.

† *The Policy of Guild Socialism*, p. 18, also from N.G.L., 6d.

regret it the more because the ideas of Guild Socialism seem to be so admirably suited to the method of social advance for which I am here pleading. Fully agreeing with the present leaders of the movement that "parliamentarism" is not the means for achieving the end, I am equally convinced that violence will not do it. At the Annual Conference of the National Guild League in May, 1920, the following resolution was adopted:—

"This Conference, holding that the firm establishment of Guild Socialism is impossible without the supercession of the administrative and coercive machinery of the Capitalist State by forms of organisation created by, and directly expressing, the will of the workers themselves, welcomes the Soviet system as a form of organisation complying with this condition. It holds, however, that the exact form of organisation required in any country cannot be determined in advance of the situation which calls it into being, and it therefore cannot affirm that the Soviet system is necessarily the best or the only form of revolutionary organisation for this country."

This resolution is interpreted as "definitely placing guildsmen in the revolutionary ranks." If this is taken to imply that which we are contending for in this book—a complete change of the present system without using coercive measures, no exception can be taken to it. Perhaps the only reason that Guild Socialists do not state this unequivocally is a matter of tactics, a belief that the forces of reaction will never yield before a foe which states in advance that it will not resort to extreme measures. If so it is at least so far good. But to me it would seem that the path of safety is to make a perfectly definite pronouncement against what are commonly called revolutionary methods. In the non-co-operation movement in India we have seen how a pacifist leader like Ghandi can be swept off his feet by the very forces he has called into being. The enthusiasm he has aroused he cannot direct along the

only channels that he himself regards as safe and effective. So it may be with the growing movement of Guild Socialism. If once it should enter upon the method of violence or even allow the other side to choose the weapons for it, it would be essentially denying its own deepest spirit. The movement would become merely one for an economic change not one for a new spirit in human society.

Let us take warning from the Russian Revolution of which Bertrand Russell writes :

“ The ultimate source of the whole train of evils lies in the Bolshevik outlook on life ; in its dogmatism of hatred and its belief that human nature can be completely transformed by force. . . . In the principles of Bolshevism there is more desire to destroy ancient evils than to build up new goods ; it is for this reason that success in destruction has been so much greater than in construction. . . . Men must be persuaded to the attempt by hope, not driven to it by despair.”*

The very essence of Guild Socialism is freedom and the full development of the individual. If these great spiritual goods are to be won they must be won in ways wholly consistent with the end in view. A great faith is needed if this spirit is to be maintained even when the forces of reaction take up the offensive, and even when appearances suggest that only by meeting violence with violence can the ideals for which we stand be saved from complete submergence. It is the very object of the Christian religion to give such a faith and to enable those who are standing for truth to stand to their position even when “ truth is on the scaffold.” The Christian movement, generally speaking, is guilty of having done far too little serious thinking about the order of society which would truly express the lofty principles it professes, and it has made far too little serious effort to carry these principles

* *The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism*, p. 176. (London George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.)

out. The movement of social democracy has spoken too much of conditions and assumed too generally the inevitability of class-warfare ; it has thought too little of the deeper sources which alone can give permanence and value to any movement and overcome all obstacles. Let us recognise how deeply each needs the other and discover ever fresh ways of uniting forces for the enrichment of human life and the creation of a society worthy of our true selves. This is a line of experiment opening up before us with alluring possibilities.

It would be easy enough to give other instances of experiments which have the same kind of illustrative value. Probably every reader of this volume will be able from personal knowledge or reading to add one or more. Our object is to be served, however, not by the collection of very many such cases but by making the point that this is the kind of activity that is peculiarly needed to-day and that the Christian revolutionary recognises as his special contribution to the solution of our problem. Let us summarise the points of positive value. Every such experiment gives us a means of testing out our theories both in regard to their essential value and in regard to the possibility of securing acceptance of them. All kinds of practical difficulties crop up when a theory is put into operation, difficulties which it is impossible to foresee. As these are met one by one we either discover new possibilities in the principles we are seeking to apply, or we have to challenge them and it may be modify them in the light of experience. We are driven back repeatedly to first principles, and nothing helps us more in getting our minds really clear on these than the persistent attempt to apply them in difficult situations.

Very often men discard ideals on the supposition that they will not work. They assume that other people are not ready for them. They have been so accustomed to see only one side of their neighbour that they do not know he has another side. Nothing

reveals the other side like boldly appealing to it. A national crisis, a fire, a shipwreck, any urgent call for help brings out the hidden possibilities of good, the latent heroism, in ordinary men and women. The experiments for which we plead will do this. They summon men to be their best. They need courage and altruism, and so they find these very qualities. We shall never know how many there are who are ready for high endeavour and great sacrifice until we embark on a programme that cannot be fulfilled without them.

V

Such experiments therefore give hope. They help men to believe not only in one another and in God, but in the actual possibility of creating a new world order. It is small wonder that people are pessimistic when they see this vast machine of modern industry grinding out its myriad products and grinding up its human lives in the process. To look only at its size and complexity is surely to be dismayed. But let us see some efforts being made wherein the free spirit of man transcends the machine, some places where its iron grip is being relaxed as the creators of a new order are working out some living experiment, and we begin to feel that the machine is not omnipotent, we take heart and go forward in the way.

The hope which is thus born is not a mere passing enthusiasm. We have seen how one experiment opens the way to another. If we stand theorising on the brink of great adventures we can see but a very little way. But every step forward, however halting, and even if it be not entirely in the right direction, helps to bring into view some further possibility. One of the chief gains of this method is its continually expanding thought of human progress. Neither Guild Socialism nor any other scheme for human welfare promises a complete fulfilment of all our hopes.

Imperfect they all are at the best, and imperfect are we who seek to realise these dreams. But the path towards perfection is the path of high endeavour, living dangerously in the world of industry no less than in the world of the spirit.

In these experiments moreover, men and women are bound together in a close fellowship that gives a new quality to all they do. The "comradeship of the trenches" is known in the world of industry. People feel that they are striving not simply for their own living, not simply even for the good of the community, but that they are making a contribution to the future for their children and their children's children and are linked together in working out the one divine purpose which dignifies and beautifies the humblest and meanest act. It is such fellowship in service that is needed to quicken the life of to-day. I am convinced that there are multitudes of people who never will be able to give their best service to the world's work unless they can discover themselves and others and God in just such a living fellowship. This is the spirit which is the very antitheses of the monotony and deadness of so much of the work rendered in modern industry. The joy of battle will come into any community that steps out on such adventures. But it will be a battle in which the enemy is not an army of men but a system that strangles men, evils that must be and can be overcome. Not fear, but hope and love will be the binding force.

Those who hold that self-interest must, in the last resort, be the motive for economic activities seem to me to miss the most splendid thing in life. The great creative spirits of the world have not appealed to men on the basis even of an enlightened self-interest. Christ called men to leave home and family, to undertake an arduous work, to brave dangers *for the sake of others*. It is for others that a mother will slave and toil and even sacrifice her life; it is for others that a man will give his life when fire or water threaten; it

was for others that Livingstone toiled through African jungles, that Florence Nightingale spent strength and fortune, that Dr. Barnardo devoted his skill and capacity. This motive must be brought into industry if industry is to be saved from futility and conflict. When we see those who labour in mines and factories as really our brothers, when the labourer sees the capitalist as a brother, social justice will come as the direct result of brotherliness—love in action. Is this brotherliness possible in industry? Can we afford to apply it? Can we see how to transfer it from the personal sphere to our corporate activities? These are some of the questions society must answer if it is to emerge from its present distress. Every experiment that throws light on the answer should be welcomed even if we see much in it to criticise. We can never know the answer unless we do make such experiments as those referred to in this chapter.

And these experiments just because of their difficulty and danger throw men back upon God. It is in Him, not as a dogma but as a living Person that we are yet to find the power and the guidance needed in breaking up all evil systems and creating better ones. Men are not finding God to-day because He seems to be hidden behind theological definitions and confined in exclusive organisations. But God is not really there. He is in no rocky tomb of our making. He is risen and has appeared to a lonely woman here, to a group of fishermen there. He is abroad in the world where men are taking risks and striving with heart and soul for the world-wide co-operative commonwealth, where truth is sought in sincerity and where men dream and strive together. So, even though some of these experiments may not be initiated with a Christian name or motive, perhaps it will be through them that our age becomes more aware of God as an active force, the Leader in the great campaign.

So it is that we may hope to break through the tangled web of our economic organisation and while

it is being unravelled, weave again the same threads into a fair fabric. There must be production, interchange, labour, direction, credit, combination and even in some sense competition. The weaving of these threads cannot be left to a blind fate. The conscious effort of many, who are working each at his own little piece of the pattern but all directed by the Master Weaver, is needed if the work is to be well and truly done. None may see the whole pattern while as yet it is in the weaving. But if we can see one part, if we can know that it belongs to a complete scheme, if we can work at that part faithfully, we have done something of permanent worth.

CHAPTER X
THE WORLD OF NATIONS

There are many who believe that War is disallowed by Christianity, and who would rejoice that it were forever abolished ; but there are few who are willing to maintain an undaunted and unyielding stand against it. They can talk of the loveliness of Peace, and argue against the lawfulness of War ; but when difficulty or suffering would be the consequence, they will not refuse to do what they know to be unlawful ; they will not practice the peacefulness which they say they admire. Those who are ready to sustain the consequences of undeviating obedience are the supporters of whom Christianity stands in need. She wants men who are willing to *suffer* for her principles.

JONATHAN DYMOND.

I will venture to say this, that if all the ministers of Christ's Gospel were, with one voice, constantly, courageously, earnestly, to preach to the nations the Truce of God, and were to denounce War, not merely as costly and cruel and barbarous, but as essentially and eternally un-Christian, another war in the civilised world would become impossible.

HENRY RICHARD.

CHAPTER X

THE WORLD OF NATIONS

I

IF the contemplation of our economic organisation tends to produce a sense of impotence and even pessimism in the would-be reformer it is no less true that the thought of the long story of wars and rumours of wars and our present international disorder has a like effect. For no one knows how many generations, men have fought and killed one another. One Empire after another has risen to power through success in battle and has declined largely as a result of its devotion to militarism and the consequent destruction of its finest manhood. We live in a time when war is waged on a scale hitherto undreamed of, when our increased knowledge and power of nature renders it unspeakably terrible, when the aeroplane and the submarine have made a war on civilians a recognised part of the game. Not armies but nations fight one another to-day. When war begins anywhere it threatens, and in some sense involves, all the rest of the world. The "War to end war" has left a world not only economically ruined but building on those ruins vast preparations for yet another war. Financial considerations may lead to a certain slowing of the pace but they are not nearly strong enough to create peace. If Anatole France is anywhere near the mark when he says that Europe is dying it is clear that the international life needs new creative forces to come in from some quarter. Whence are they to come? Is there any hope for the world of nations?

It is customary for those who seek to answer these questions to look to the League of Nations and other similar attempts to order our international life from above. I am by no means disposed to pour scorn on the League or on such attempts as the Washington Conference. On the contrary I welcome them with real hope, and believe they should receive the support of all who look for a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Such plans are of value as a register of the growing desire for international adjustments, as providing a meeting-ground where statesmen can get face to face instead of having to discuss their differences at long-range and through intermediaries, as giving public opinion an opportunity to criticise and support the work of diplomatists, as showing, in some measure, the direction we must take in our international organisation if it is to respond to the growing family spirit in the world. These are real and not inconsiderable gains, and mean more than any specific work that may be accomplished, although their significance depends largely on the fact that certain steps are taken in common however small or timid they may be.

The League of Nations, as actually planned, has at the same time many serious flaws. The fact that it does not include some very important States, that it is bound up with so evil an instrument as the Versailles Treaty, that it is so difficult to alter its constitution and that this constitution is so far from democratic—these are among the more serious blemishes. One is also bound to admit that some of its work is what is called in China "face-pidgin," an attempt to put a good appearance on self-interested and cynical acts. This is not the place, however, for an exhaustive treatment of the question, for I am anxious rather to discuss constructively another method of approach to our international problems. The following words written while the war was still in progress, seem to have an added weight now in the

light of actual events, and in turning from this aspect of the subject I cannot do better than quote them. They were written by Mr. Brailsford in his book, *A League of Nations*.

“Our Utopians are not Utopian enough. They do not themselves realise how great a transformation they are proposing. From force to conference, from armaments to reason, from monopoly to free intercourse, from rival alliances to a society of nations, from the sovereign state to the federal league, from exclusive nationalism to international solidarity—it means the re-shaping of all our diplomatic traditions, and the broadening of patriotism itself. The experienced and sceptical mind turns from the adventure in despair: it at least thinks clearly in its pessimism. The hopeless leader is the man who would tinge his vengeance and his caution with a little idealism, the man whose perorations are a wordy picture of the luminous future which all his acts will deny. We must choose our end, and, with the end, the means that fit it.”*

II

As contrasted with this method of political *rapprochement* the way of the Christian revolution may seem slow and ineffective. What I would maintain again at this point is that it is the one way by which the real end can actually be reached; it is on the line of an ultimate solution and not a mere readjustment within a system whose inherent weaknesses will surely lead to a break-down sooner or later. Everyone will admit that the League of Nations needs something more than machinery to be a real success; it needs a soul. Once that new spirit arises, the League of Nations will not only do what it sets out to do, it will begin to clear the way for something far better, perhaps

* *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

for such a World State as Mr. H. G. Wells has pictured.* But without such a spirit we shall see the old story of intrigue and influence defeating the ends of justice, and closer association giving, it may be, fresh opportunities for friction. The Christian revolutionary is seeking to create in this strange mix-up of a world the actual beginnings of the better world. He is beginning to build, in however small a way, a real international society which nothing whatever can split.

It seems perfectly clear to me that the foundation principle of this society must be a settled conviction that all war is absolutely wrong for any of its members.

This, of course, is not to make light of the causes of war, which may be likened to the disease of the body politic of which war is but a symptom. But to say that we cannot root out war until we have rooted out its causes is to carry the simile too far, and is moreover, to lapse into pessimism. The causes of duelling, affronted honour, disputes in love, pride, self-will, etc., are still rampant in the world to-day. In most civilised states the method of duelling has been abolished as contrary to our idea of social justice, for the arbitrament of the sword or pistol can never decide which combatant was in the right. So to leave the problem of war as a method till we have removed its causes would be absurd. The causes may remain for generations. But there is no reason why this method of handling such disputes as arise between nations should not be abolished in one generation. The first step in dealing with it is to create in the minds of as many as possible an unalterable belief that war as a method is not only foolish but actually wrong.

If men and women could have this conviction and act upon it under any circumstances, whatever the provocation, those men and women would be an actual centre of unity in the midst of the world, even when all others were at war. If any considerable number

* In *The Salvaging of Civilisation*, q.v.

of such persons were known to exist in nations that were on the verge of war, statesmen would be bound to take account of the fact, and if the number were large enough they would be compelled to settle the dispute without war. Whatever method were used for such a settlement it could not have less connection with the essential justice of the case, for war has no connection whatever with it. It is pretty certain, that, in these days, it would actually have much more, and that a very serious attempt would be made to arrive at a just settlement that would therefore be a lasting one.

This picture of the future is based on a hypothesis which we must examine a little more carefully. It is not possible in this volume to state all the arguments *pro* and *con* the view, which is shared by all the writers in this series, that war is absolutely contrary to the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ. But it is worth while urging that this is a view which was held in the early days of the Church, that it has the weight of some of the ablest and holiest of the Fathers,* that it has been shared by smaller or larger groups in the Church ever since† and that to-day there are thousands in all Christian bodies who hold it passionately. The issue is often confused by a false idea of the relation of the Christian to the State, an idea which we have dealt with to some extent in this volume.‡ It is also confused by the failure to distinguish between the spirit and motive a man may have in doing anything and the nature of the thing which he does ; this confusion also we have referred to already.§

Stated in its simplest terms the conviction rests upon the plain fact that in war men are called upon to do many things that are plainly contrary to the things

* *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, by Dr. C. J. Cadoux.

† *The Remnant*, by Prof. R. M. Jones.

‡ See also *Christ and Cæsar*, especially the last chapter.

§ Chap. III, p. 72.

for which Christ stands. The Christian's whole life should be an expression of the spirit of His Master. He is called to respect all other persons and to love them as He loves Himself, to overcome evil with good, to love his enemies, that is to say not simply to abstain from hating them but to meet them with positive goodwill. The plea of necessity is the one plea that most people who call themselves Christians are prepared to bring forward. If it can be shown that there is another way of meeting the situation, and that this way of war does not actually touch the real root of the difficulty the plea of necessity falls to the ground. But in any case that plea is not one which, according to the position stated in this book, can be maintained. It can never be necessary to do evil if the one thing needful is to do good. We may have to suffer ; others may have to suffer ; the wrong cause may overpower the right one ; we may even seem to encourage evil. But for us the way of the Cross is perfectly plain and decides the issue. And this is not the path of saving oneself at the expense of others or of the cause ; it is the way by which we can best serve others and bring in the Kingdom of God in all the world. The simple question, is what is our standard of values ? If safety, we fight : if to change the heart of evil into one of good then what ?

The attitude towards international war taken in this volume is, I believe, that of the Early Church. Dr. Cadoux admits the fact that the Church stands in a very different position to-day. But he asks the question, " Is there anything in that difference, is there anything in our modern conditions which really invalidates the testimony against war as the early Christians bore it ? " His answer so admirably summarises the position that I venture to quote it in full. " Not, we may answer, the passing away of the eschatological outlook, for the great apologia of Origenes is as independent of that outlook as any modern Christian could wish—not the development

of national life and sentiment, for Christianity lifts the disciple of Christ above racial divisions and interests just as truly now as it did then—not laws making military service compulsory, for the laws of States can never make right for the Christian what according to the higher law of the Kingdom of God is wrong for him—not his obligations to society, for these obligations he already renders in overflowing measure by the power and influence of his life and prayers as a Christian—not the breaking forth of high-handed aggression and tyranny and outrage, for these things were continually breaking forth in those early times, and the Christian now, as then, has his own appointed method of curing them, a method more radical and effectual than the use of arms, and involving him in a full measure of suffering and self-sacrifice—not admiration for, or indebtedness to follow-citizens who have risked life and limb in the struggle for righteousness on the field of battle, for the right thing for a man to do has to be decided by reference to his own subjective conditions, and one can fully esteem and honour the relative good in a sub-Christian course of conduct without being thereby bound to adopt it one self—not our inability to discover at once the full meaning of Jesus' teaching for our complicated social and economic institutions, for such discovery is a lengthy process, in which one step forward at a time has to be taken, and unless the step is taken on each issue as it becomes clear, no further light is to be hoped for on the issues that are next to it in order of obscurity and complexity—not the unreadiness of the rest of the Church to become pacific, for the individual Christian with a true message must never wait until the whole Church agrees with him before he lives up to it and declares it, otherwise all promise of spiritual progress within the Church is gone—not, finally, the offence and unpopularity which the message evokes or the vastness of the obstacles that lie in its path, for the best service Christians have ever

done for the world has been done under the shadow of the world's frown and in the teeth of the world's opposition."*

III

For those who have "so learned Christ" there is one royal road to international peace. To be absolutely faithful to the Way, to bring as many as possible into it, and so to build up a community that can show the power of the peaceable spirit in a world at war or drifting towards war,—this is a programme that has actually been attempted, as the following instances will show.

The well-known "holy experiment" of William Penn and his friends in governing the State of Pennsylvania is the best example in history of an attempt to carry on the government of a State on entirely pacifist lines. That the idea is essentially that of these pages will be seen by William Penn's own words. "The nations want a precedent," he said, "and because I have been exercised about the nature and end of government among men, it is reasonable to expect that I should endeavour to establish a just and righteous one in this province, that others may take example by it." The colony was founded at a time when there was constant and bitter warfare between the Indians and the white settlers. On the face of it it seemed absurd that any settlement could be made and maintained without armed defence in a country where the white people were regarded as interlopers and thieves and where there was apparently nothing to appeal to in the Indians. Penn, however, believed that there was something to appeal to. He went unarmed to the Indian chiefs. He purchased the land from them although he had received a grant of it from the Crown. He made fair dealing a foundation principle in all his relations with them. A jury

* *Op. cit.*, pp. 263-4. Cf. also the same author's treatment of the subject in *The Guidance of Jesus for To-day*.

of six white and six coloured people decided on cases of dispute. No armed force was raised and there was no method of defence open to the settlers but that of honesty and goodwill.

Looking back on the experiment it is easy to say that the Indians were exceptional, but that was not the judgment of Penn's contemporaries. To them the experiment was simple folly. Yet enough people were found to inaugurate it and it was not long before many others flocked to the colony in order to be "free from the mouldy errors of tradition," and to live in a place where the spirit of fear was overcome by that of love. For more than seventy years there was unbroken peace, and the experiment came to an end because the spirit of fear came in once more, introduced by those who had not learnt the secret of overcoming it. The Quakers were not dissuaded by failure but overborne by those who lacked their spirit. What was exceptional was not the conditions, the nature of the Indian chiefs or even the settlers. It was that the way of Christ was fearlessly adopted in a situation in which it seemed sure to fail. The world was no more ready for this experiment than it is for a similar one in the midst of Europe to-day. But there were some people—quite ordinary people most of them—who had somehow got hold of the idea of the Christian Revolution, and who believed that the only way to make the world ready was to act as if it were ready. The impartial reading of this story to-day causes one to wonder not so much at the striking success that attended the effort as at the blindness of people who will not learn from it and apply this same principle throughout our international life to-day.*

Perhaps no illustration could more clearly demonstrate the close relation between disarmament and policy. It would be absurd to suppose that Pennsylvania could have continued without an army if

* See *Quakerism in the American Colonies*, by R. M. Jones. Section V on Pennsylvania.

there had not been a policy of good-will and fair dealing. If national policies are aggressive and dictated by capitalist interests we need not expect disarmament conferences to do more than suggest limitation and restrictions that may ease the financial strain, but will do little or nothing to prevent war. The Christian pacifist must therefore be something much more than an anti-militarist. All that we are contending for in this volume, and others in the series, is bound up together as a part of one way of life. But that way does involve pacifism and perhaps nothing really exhibits the meaning of the Christian revolutionary principle more clearly than the choice that must be made in this particular.

During the recent war the choice was peculiarly hard. Almost everyone believed the aims of the war to be idealistic rather than merely national or financial. The Churches were nearly unanimous in their support of the war (on both sides). The fate of the nation and of the world seemed to stand in the balance, and refusal to fight seemed like leaving to destruction all the hard-won gains of the race. There was a terrific appeal in England to the chivalry of a nation not immediately threatened, to help a little nation which she had sworn to protect. The war was presented as the last one, destined finally to overthrow the very spirit of militarism. It is small wonder that many who loved peace found themselves engaged in war.

But there were some who were not so deceived. For them the way of the Christian Revolution (whether so described or discerned or not) was still the only one to follow. Many during war-time expressed themselves as glad that there was one Christian Society (the Quakers) who did not enter into the war. Very many have so expressed themselves since its close. Why is this? Is it not due to an instinct that after all there is a higher way than war, and that we ought to be able to see and take it? Those who belonged to the Society of Friends, and a number of others who felt

with them, formed during those terrible years of hate and havoc a community which could not be broken. There in the midst of a world at war were some tens of thousands, may be hundreds, who were already acting as members of the ideal society. They were the nucleus of the all-inclusive divine-human family that is one day to spread over all the earth. To very many they seemed simply to be "saving their own skins," and even stabbing their comrades in the back. To others who thought of them more kindly theirs was a narrowly individualistic type of religion, and they were mere cranks more to be pitied than to be spurned. To others their chief fault seemed to have been lack of indignation towards evil or of the sense of national honour which inspired their fellow countrymen.

No doubt there were all types of men in the ranks of the so-called Conscientious Objectors. But the real inwardness of their position shows not an individualistic type of religion, but so keen a social conscience that they could not break their unity with all mankind,—not a lack of moral sense but a conviction that justice is to be established through forgiveness and not through punishment,—not a craven fear but the love that casts out fear. Let me quote the words of one of these men standing before a court-martial, as typical of the sentiments of many.

"I stand here," said Malcolm Sparkes, who was the moving spirit in the initiation of the Industrial Council for the Building Industry, "reverently to witness for the heroic Christianity of Jesus Christ; for the belief that the only way to overcome evil is to conquer it by indomitable love and unwearied service. By this I mean a love that never admits defeat; that goes on loving and serving regardless of risk, regardless of possible consequences, in literal interpretation of our Master's orders, "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." It will no doubt

be urged that such a belief is hopelessly Utopian and idealistic, and cannot be brought down into the practical world of to-day. I am convinced that what I can see others can see and nothing will persuade me that the world is not ready for an ideal for which I am ready. Truth is more to me than victory, and if the great forces of love and service are ever to triumph over those of fear and mistrust, someone must try to make a beginning. I am anxious to take my place amongst those beginners, and shall count it a privilege to make sacrifices, and if need be to face punishment, in such a cause."

It was in this spirit that hundreds of men did face punishment. Some were condemned to death, and some were actually shot (though not in England); many were given terms of imprisonment with hard labour which in the aggregate were far more than the law permits for the most hardened criminals; many were threatened and bullied, given the field-punishment of "crucifixion," beaten till they fainted, starved in hope of submission, driven out of their minds by ill-treatment. Many left prison to life-long enfeeblement or early death. Ten died in gaol in England. In the main these things were suffered gladly and even with a triumphant spirit. The crime of these men was absolute loyalty to the whole human family and to God their Father as they understood him. It was a crime because it meant standing up to a nation inflamed with the war-spirit and refusing it obedience, because they took the words of the early disciples as theirs, "We must obey God rather than men." The question is, Were these men in the line of progress for the human race towards the realisation of the Creative Dream of Jesus Christ? Because I believe they were I see in their action not a passing incident, unpleasant perhaps and reflecting little credit on our country but to be forgotten as soon as possible; I see rather an illustration of the Way of the Christian Revolution, creative, hopeful, God-inspired,—a way

which, if only many more will take it, must lead us more surely than any Covenants or Pacts into the day when Peace on Earth shall be an actual fact.*

But the way of the Christian Revolution in war is not merely a negative way. It calls for an active expression of goodwill. When a nation has not taken the Christian way, when it has actually embarked upon war (a war which may be *for the nation as a whole* the best way it can discover for meeting evil in view of the principles that have hitherto dictated its policy) it is amazingly difficult for the Christian revolutionary to see how he can act in other than an obstructive and negative way. Everything he does is liable to be misunderstood; his good will be evil spoken of; he will be hampered in his actions because he is supposed to be the friend of the enemy. Nevertheless the recent war does show several activities undertaken by such groups that were a true expression of this Way.

One of the first things organised by the friends of peace was the Friends' Emergency Committee. Its activities were directed to helping the nationals of enemy countries who were stranded in England at the outbreak of hostilities. The condition of many of these people was deplorable. A large percentage lost their occupations at once. No one had a good word to say for them. In a number of cases their homes and shops were raided by angry mobs. The hardship was all the greater because very many of them were British in all but name. Their sympathies were not with their own nation: sometimes their sons were actually fighting in the British army; but they had not been naturalised and were therefore technically enemies. The public did not look into facts such as

* Details of what was actually suffered by these men and the position they took up can be found in "N.C.F.," published at 5, York Buildings, Adelphi, London, W.C.2, price 1s. and *I Appeal unto Cæsar*, by Mrs. Henry Hobhouse (George Allen & Unwin, price 1s.), also *Conscription and Conscience*, by J. W. Graham, *q.v.* Now that war is over these things ought not to be forgotten if we are to learn our lesson.

these. The Churches had no good word to say for any who bore the hated German name. The papers on several occasions directed their attacks against those who were working for them. When a terrible evil, such as the sinking of the *Lusitania* or the shooting of Nurse Cavell, was announced the indignation of many unthinking persons was directed against these innocent aliens who should have had protection from the country of their adoption. Many of the men were put into internment camps and one of the big services of the Committee was the visiting of these, organising industrial work for the interned and keeping them in touch with their families who often needed much help. Another activity was repatriating a considerable number especially women and children, and another the interchange of personal letters between them and their relations across the frontiers.

Unknown to the Society of Friends which organised this work, a committee was formed by like minded people in Germany and care was bestowed upon British and other prisoners and interned aliens and their families. Thus on both sides of this great gulf arches were being built in the bridge of goodwill that was to span the torrent. The actual unity was being demonstrated at a time when the one outstanding fact, patent to the whole world, was disunity.*

It may be said that such activities were altogether unavailing in the midst of world-war. They could do nothing to stem the tide of passion, or to right the wrongs committed. They were a pathetic proof of the weak, futile efforts of men and women of goodwill. It would seem absurd to offer this illustration of a particular method, for it only shows the utter inadequacy of such a method. On the face of it such reasoning seems conclusive, but there is something more to be

* For a fuller account of this and similar work see *Friends' Service in War Time*, by Elizabeth Fox Howard (Friends' Bookshop, 140, Bishopsgate, London, E.C.), price 6d. See also *A Service of Love in War Time*, by Rufus M. Jones.

said. Of course a very small minority in the nation will not be able to make a very effective expression of their faith when the mass of the people are carried away by quite other feelings. We may remind ourselves again of the simile used by Mencius. The fact that a cupful of water does not extinguish a wagon load of fuel cannot be taken as proof that the method of putting out fire by water is a mistaken one. It simply means that we have not used enough water. We may admit that there was not enough of the revolutionary love of Christ in the warring nations to extinguish the universal blaze. But there was enough to do something of quite definite worth.

In the first place groups of people were filled with a new spirit. There are many homes to-day where the possibility of international brotherhood is realised, and where a new vision of the world-family in Christ has come through these despised efforts. Many whose war experiences would have soured them for life and who would have almost ceased to believe in human goodness or in a Divine providence have become builders of a new world because of the contacts formed in these dark days.

In the second place a certain witness was borne to the fact of a deeper unity. Very many in the Churches and outside them will now be thankful that there were Quakers in the world to demonstrate this spirit in war-time, although at the time they were indifferent or even hostile to this enterprise. It is easy to say that all Christians should be able to join in such activities even though they may not hold the "extreme pacifist" position. But the fact remains that when the test came it was the extremists who organised and carried out the work with no official and very little unofficial help or approval from those who thought their Christian duty called them to kill their brethren.

In the third place a bridge was actually built that made the beginnings of reconciliation possible when the war was over. In Germany and Austria the Quakers and those who worked with them have been

welcomed everywhere. The other day a child in Frankfort saw another child rescued from an accident on the street and in telling about it said that a Quaker had saved the little one. "Why do you think it was a Quaker?" "Because it is the Quakers who help the little children," was the reply. Ought it not to have been Christian rather than Quaker, and would not the more inclusive word have been used if all Christians had stood where the Quakers stood when the war was being fought? To-day there are many towns and villages in Central Europe where a real work of reconciliation is going on where children are being fed and cared for, where disease is being met, where hope is being created out of despair, through the work of the people who were despised during the war and thought to be "friends of the enemy." This has been possible because there were some who believed in this world-family idea and who tried to express it even at the height of that frenzy which made most people forget it. That these others did what they saw to be their duty at great sacrifice and with amazing heroism I do not for a moment deny. That they saw or took the one way of building up a human family in all the world I cannot for one moment admit.

Let me quote as an illustration of how these islands are arising in the ocean a letter from a child in Germany to the Committee of American Friends.

Dear Quakers,

To-day we were told in school all what you do for us children. During the whole time of war I was not aware there were people in England and America who loved us. However, now I know all that you do for us. You are so far from home, and in America I am sure it would be nicer and better for you. From morning to night you are working for us. We have been thinking why you do all this. You love us because we are God's children. I thank you for the many gifts you have given me and the children of Frankfort. If ever I should meet the English or an American in distress I shall also most willingly help it.

Your grateful,

K.L.

Is not this building for the future on firmer foundations than those which have been laid by a "great victory" and a vindictive treaty? Who is really doing the permanent work out of which a new international society may arise?

The question comes back to the same old problem. Is the way of the New Testament really practical politics? "If thine enemy hunger feed him; if he thirst give him drink."* Where thousands of these little ones were being fed by obscure committees in London and Berlin during the war, or millions throughout Germany and Austria after it was over, was not the real "war to end war" being waged, rather than where poison-gas or tanks and all the horrible enginery of strife were being mobilised to "crush militarism"? Which is the method of One who said, "I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me; I was in prison and ye came unto me . . . Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me"? † If it is clear what the answer to these questions is we cannot escape the further one, Was Jesus right in His idea of the way in which the Kingdom of God was to come on earth? From the banks of the roaring torrent a man looks up to see a few tiny trickles of pure water coming from springs upon the mountain side. He smiles at the contrast. But it is these little streams fed from the eternal sources that will outlast the cataract filled by mighty thunderstorms. When the storms are over and the sky shines clear it is the pure water from a hundred such springs that will satisfy the thirst and rejoice the heart of thousands. Prophecies, tongues, knowledge, war, diplomacy, hatred, all will be done away. "Love never faileth."

While the Quakers took the lead and bore the main burden of such work as has been described there were

* Rom. xii. 20.

† Matt. xxv. 35, 36, 40.

many others who shared their spirit and united in the actual activities. One such group, formed during the war and outlasting it, was the Fellowship of Reconciliation organised now internationally under the name "The Movement Towards a Christian International." A few persons of varied faiths and from different classes of society came together in the closing days of 1914, finding themselves at one in the conviction that the Christian Churches had not been saying the distinctly Christian thing in relation to the war. Their agreement was, however, much more than a negative one. They believed that the principle of love as seen in the teaching, life and death of Jesus Christ was the one basis for human society, the one way of overcoming evil, and that they were bound to accept all that was involved in this principle at whatever risk to themselves and even in a world that did not as yet accept it. For them this meant the renunciation of the way of war, and a committal of their whole lives to the service of humanity in ways consistent with the Spirit of Christ. The activities of this group of persons during war-time included helping on the work already referred to, active propaganda by literature and in other ways, an experiment in the treatment of criminal children on the principle of freedom and love, and various efforts towards interpreting the same principles in the social order. It was in this group that the schemes for the Industrial Council in the Building Industry and for the Brethren of the Common Table already described, took birth. A number of other efforts were inaugurated such as one or two co-operative communities, attempts to deal with strikes and other conflicts, proposals for dealing with the Irish question. Some six or seven thousand people joined in the Fellowship in England and over a thousand in America, besides a smaller body in Holland, under the name of the Brotherhood in Christ, and many individuals in other lands. The prevailing idea was the thoroughgoing application of the method of the Christian

Revolution in every sphere of life, while, of course, the circumstances led to special emphasis on the international issue. Two post-war activities may be given as illustrating the thesis of the present chapter.

The ravages of famine and disease in Austria on account of the blockade so seriously affected the health of many children that it seemed as if nothing short of a complete change with ample food under the best conditions could save their lives and give them any prospect of normal development. The idea was conceived of bringing many of these children over to England and putting them into British homes. In the minds of members of the Fellowship who took up this scheme it was not only a case of showing kindness to the diseased and starving. It was a way by which it might become clear that there were many in England who wished to show the forgiving spirit, who believed in an international family and wanted to realise it. At a time when many were saying of the privations of the Central European peoples "serve them right," and when it was supposed that any act of forgiveness must be contingent upon a certain demonstration of national repentance (however that was to be made), there were not a few who had an entirely different attitude on this question. The movement was by no means confined to the Fellowship of Reconciliation, but the interesting thing to note is that it never could have had the success it achieved, and would in fact have broken down quite early, had not the Fellowship come forward to bear the main part of the burden. There was this deeper motive that inspired the actions and a conviction that every home that was opened to an Austrian child was like another island in the ocean. Many examples could be given to show how this service has actually created a new atmosphere in the English home and the neighbourhood and in the Austrian home when the child's letters were received and when he returned.

The second experiment was in a small town in the devastated area in France called Esnes. Here a group

of workers, French, German, Swiss, Hungarian, British, volunteered to rebuild houses at the ordinary contract rates, to take out of the receipts only what they needed for maintenance, and to turn the remainder over to some local service. The permission of the authorities was obtained and for several months the group worked together showing a new spirit of international understanding and unity in Christ. The rebuilding was not merely that of houses; it was the attempt to rebuild mutual trust and friendship right at the spot where these had been destroyed and where there seemed to be every reason for maintaining suspicion and ill-will. In a short time the results were so evident that a local land-owner who believed the French spirit could not be maintained except on hatred of her ancient enemies, moved the authorities to withdraw their consent. So terminated, because of its real success, a small but significant experiment in internationalism. It seems like a failure. But those who joined in it left with no sense of failure. For them it was plain that even this small interrupted service was a piece of building upon the permanent foundations, and that it could not be utterly destroyed.

The Movement Towards a Christian International, under whose auspices this work was undertaken, is facing many other problems. A conference on Armenia has been trying to find ways by which that much tried people may be helped not by armies but by the practical expression of love. Recent information tells of plans to bring starving Russian children through Finland, Sweden and Norway in the same way as the Austrian children were taken to British homes. The goodwill and active co-operation of governments, public companies and organisations have been secured in order to make this possible. Thus we may see another small piece of building for an international family.*

* This plan was frustrated by the refusal of the British Government to let the Russian children come into the country.

IV

To many these instances will seem like almost infinitesimal eddies in the great downward current which carries us on into national policies, misunderstandings and wars. To others they will appear as a part of a movement, often unobserved and sometimes apparently submerged, in which the deeper instincts of mankind, the God-given sense of fellowship and goodwill and that which will not be satisfied with anything short of unity, are finding imperfect expression. When we think of the very many ways in which our real unity is operating—all the religious, scientific, educational, medical, labour, organisations that overstep the national boundaries,* the multiplication of interchange in the commercial world, the beginning of international arbitration, the growth of literature that helps nations to understand each other's aspirations and culture, the increase of study in other lands than one's own, the way in which knowledge of happenings in one part of the world is flashed to other parts and affects the life and happiness of many peoples—one cannot fail to see that something is happening in the world that is far more significant and infinitely more hopeful than the drift towards war which sometimes appears to be resistless.

The Christian revolutionary believes in these forces. To him, whether they are labelled Christian or not, they seem part of this one divine purpose—God fulfilling Himself in many ways. The call of the day is to build our common life on this bedrock. Mr. Lees Smith finely voiced this thought when the Peace Proposals were under discussion in the House of Commons in December, 1916. He said :—“ The path to follow is to . . . trust yourselves boldly to those decent, kindly, humane forces which are to be found in every man and in every nation. Put behind your

* There were over 400 such when the war began ; see Woolf's *International Government* (George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.).

military decisions and Paris Conferences ; seek only terms of peace which will enable you to substitute the possibility of friendship for the continuance of hatred, and on those terms of peace erect a league of nations. Of course, it will not give you absolute security, and nothing can. I admit that, if these human forces fail us, the league of nations will break in our hands. But, if they fail us, nothing can succeed. They will not fail us. I believe that those who put their trust in the great moral forces which lie latent in the hearts of men will find that, in the long run, they have never failed mankind. Trust them once again. I say that because I see no other way by which we can save the civilisation of Europe.”*

Is there any other way ? Have not the other ways been tried and tried and tried again. Security has been our watchword and for the sake of it we have mortgaged all that was of greatest value. Not security itself but our method of working for it has proved to be “ man’s chiefest enemy.” We have gained not security but a sense of unstable equilibrium in which all the heritage of the past has seemed to be poised on the edge of a crater. We have piled up armaments thinking to make ourselves safe forsooth, when the one pledge of safety would be the bold, if risky, appeal to the good in all men. The way of the Christian Revolution still opens before us almost untried on any large scale.

Nevertheless it has been tried on occasions even by nations. They may scarcely have realised what they were doing, they have certainly not been clearly conscious that they were stepping in the path of the despised Galilean. But there have been times when His Spirit has captured a nation and when some great act of trust has been justified in the event. Let me refer to the words of Mr. Asquith, for he can scarcely be accused of idealising an event in history for the sake of proving any theory. Referring to the Treaty

* Hansard for 21st Dec., 1916.

of Ghent which closed the Anglo-American War in 1814, he says :

“ The diplomatists went to Ghent, they spent a good many months in more or less futile negotiations, and then, by one of those curious and significant waves of feeling, of which we have so many examples in history, [are they examples of the Spirit of God moving on the face of the waters ?] the public opinion of the two great countries took the business out of their hands, and said with authoritative and unmistakable emphasis, “ Peace must be made.” And Peace was made. One of the most curious features of the Treaty of Ghent, which distinguishes it, I suppose, from most of the diplomatic instruments of history, is that it takes no account, of any sort or kind, of any cause of quarrel which had led to the war. . . From the point of view of experts in diplomacy, that is one of the worst examples of their art, for it absolutely ignores all the causes of difference which had led to so much bloodshed and confusion. Yes, but judged by results, it is one of the most successful diplomatic instruments in the history of the world. For, since the conclusion of the Treaty of Ghent, despite the diplomatists and the soldiers, and despite popular passions and misunderstandings, the peace then concluded has been uniformly, consistently, and unbrokenly maintained.”

As is well-known this peace has been maintained along a few thousand miles of frontier where no fort or gun can be stationed, and in the Great Lakes which no man-of-war or gunboat can patrol. The treaty was what some would call a gamble with human nature. Shall we not rather call it staking everything on God, on the reality of His nature that is unfailing love and that He imparts to His children ? Is it not strange that this notable step, even if timidly taken, in following the way of the Master, has had so little influence in leading diplomatists and peoples to take other similar ones ?

To me it seems that one such was the step taken by the British Government after the close of the South

African war, a step which almost atoned for the wrong done by a great Empire in declaring war on two little republics, when not only did the victors refrain from levying a huge tax for reparations but actually advanced £50,000,000 to repair the damage they had done. When furthermore they granted such a liberal form of self-government as to make the defeated colonies practically independent, we can easily see, in retrospect, that a very wise step was taken, the results of which have been abundantly evident in the succeeding years. But when it came to making peace with Germany, a Prime Minister, who during the South African war had been called a Pro-Boer, appealed to the country to send him to Paris to demand impossible indemnities which would bleed the vanquished white and to hang the Kaiser! How far are we from learning the lessons of history! Could any way have been devised better calculated to keep aflame the fires of hatred and revenge than the crushing terms of a treaty so wholly different from those to which we have just referred?

Yet once again in British history it seems as if the method of trust and the forgetting of past disputes were to be tried with success. Driven to the course by the terrible results of the method of force, it is nevertheless a matter of deepest thankfulness that the Irish Question after all these centuries is being settled on terms that do real credit to both sides. Is not this another example of the way of Christian Revolution, carried out indeed not by those who see clearly what they are doing, but nevertheless illustrating the fact that goodwill and trust can actually accomplish what violence is utterly unable to do?

V

There is a Christian way for nations. It is possible to meet evil with good upon the large scale, nay even to conquer evil with good. The difficulty is that it means so much to follow it. In a few rare cases a

nation that follows a lower policy may rise, almost in spite of itself, to some higher plain and take a bold step such as these we have referred to. But such a policy cannot be consistently followed without other very big changes in the national life. What are we to do about our relations to what we are pleased to call the backward races? How can the "white man's burden" be carried unless we use an army? What of the demands of Japan, let us say, for areas to colonise and mineral resources to exploit? If we are to find the Christian way and to pursue it we must revise many of our ideas on these questions. For example is it certain that the trusteeship for the weaker races is being carried as well by our political supervision as by our educational and missionary ambassadors? Is it possible that the dangers from the inroads of savage tribes would disappear if the principles of William Penn were being practised in N.W.India?

These questions carry us too far afield for the purposes of this volume. What I want to urge is that if we were determined to carry out internationally the way of Christ we should soon discover more of what is meant. I believe in a disarmed nation. I believe it would be possible for even a great nation that had no aggressive aims commercial or political and that was determined to deal fairly with all her neighbours to lay down her arms altogether—I believe such an act of heroism and faith, which would of course be very risky, would at once liberate fresh forces of goodwill in the world. I believe if this course were taken not for mere safety or economy or laziness but as a way by which the world might be led out of the vicious circle of war and preparations for war, it would be welcomed in every nation under heaven as the God-given word of release. Until the Christian revolutionary boldly states this as his answer to a world at war his appeal will lack its final force.

Some will say that this is all very well for Christian or semi-Christian nations but what of those that are

pagan or savage? As a matter of fact it is the Christian nations, so-called, that lead the military movement in the world. No one who knows China will regard her peace-loving people as a menace if the nations of the West give up their aggressive policy. It is in the school of the "Christian" peoples that she is learning the meaning of the word militarism. The experience of the missionaries in the Cannibal Islands, of Dr. Pennell on the Afghan Frontier, of Penn among the Red Indians, of Livingstone in the heart of Africa and many others amply proves that there is something in the most degraded that is appealed to by simple friendship and goodwill.* A nation that dared to be Christian in all its dealings would have nothing to fear from the non-Christian world. There might be some disasters in the process of civilisation or penetration—a legacy of so much ill treatment in the past—but what would they be? Nothing for one moment to compare with the losses in a single engagement of the World War.

The critic who concentrates first upon the uncivilised or semi-civilised is wont to turn his attention next to the great military powers of the West. Yes, he says in effect, I grant that there is something to be said for your policy in these circumstances, but how are you to meet a mad-dog nation like Germany in 1914? So it always is with those who defend an untenable position; they shift their ground and deny their own arguments. Surely everyone must realise that militarism could never flourish in one nation surrounded by a world of others that really loved peace and had no aggressive designs. German militarism was the child not of a special breed of Prussian leaders, but of a set of circumstances to which all the nations had been contributing for years. In every nation moreover there are far more really good-hearted folk than the deliberately evil-minded. Let us treat a nation that plots some evil with real kindness

* See examples in *The Arm of God*, and elsewhere.

and we should appeal at once to the larger part of the people and awaken a spirit that would conquer, from within, the evil spirit that tended to dominate the national life. If any nation really tried this way it might indeed fail at the first effort ; there might be something like a crucifixion. But if we believe in God as the eternal Purposer of good to all, as Love that cannot finally be defeated, dare we doubt the resurrection morn ?

We are often told that the way of love is all very well in personal contacts but clearly impossible in international disputes. This *a priori* argument carries very little weight with me for the following reasons. First, we have scarcely ever tried it out, and where it has been tried, as in some of the cases given, there is at least some promise of success if tried on a larger scale. Second, we have not even thought out what it would mean. Were one-tenth part of the skill and energy that is devoted to war turned to this constructive task we should soon make discoveries that would be as surprising as the Zeppelin would have been to Wellington. Third, we actually rely so little on this way in our personal life that it is small wonder if we are sceptical about its application in the wider sphere. I believe that everyone who knows something of the triumph of love over great obstacles in his personal relations with individuals has some hope that similar methods would succeed internationally. But it is quite clear that we need a lot more thinking, and especially corporate thinking, on this problem. This is one of the chief constructive tasks of the comrades of the Christian Revolution.

VI

Very imperfectly have I stated the position that a growing number are, I believe, coming to see as the only possible line of solution for our international disorders. It is only dimly realised. The Churches

and the public men of to-day are all peace-lovers up to a certain point. The war has sickened all of us of the methods of violence. There is a great reaction from the days when men spoke glibly of the purifying influence of war, the comradeship of the trenches and all the other clap-trap which is always brought out again whenever a war actually breaks out.

But there is a deep misgiving in my heart. Is this lip-service to peace any use at all unless it springs from a deep conviction that war is utterly and absolutely impossible for the Christian? That is to say is it of any use to stem the tides of passion when again a situation arises in which it seems as if war alone could defend the things we count most dear? For there are terrific forces in human nature that make for war. They can only be met by forces even mightier. I do not believe that the fiery denunciations that come from statesmen and preachers who but yesterday were urging all into a "holy war" have any sufficient force to meet the greed and hate and prejudice, or even to overcome the indifference on the tides of which nations are repeatedly carried into bloody strife.

I believe there is a force strong enough to do this. I see it working in men who went cheerfully to prison, in soldiers who have seen through the hollow shams and renounced the way of war for ever, in little groups who are bound together in a clear recognition that their loyalty to one another in Christ makes a stronger claim upon them than even the loyalty they owe to a nation.

"Humanity has reached a point at which mutual completion, co-operation, education of the nations is essential. No nation can solve its own problems without the aid of the traditions of foreign nations. France needs Germany and Germany France. Germany needs the spirit of the Slav and the Slavs need that of Germany. England needs German and Germany England. The individual nations are no less necessary to one another for their completion than are the two

sexes. Without such higher companionship both nations and souls must be ruined by their one-sidedness. In the union of races will the Universal Christ be born in us."

So wrote a German, Professor Förster, when the war was at its height. It was a brave and difficult utterance to make at such a time. To-day we can all echo it. But how many of us will still see its truth if once again a war "for humanity and freedom" breaks out and some one nation is pilloried as the Anti-christ?

What is needed is a conviction that will outlast all hatred, that will survive when passion is at its height, that will see through the sophistries of national or religious leaders, that finds its foundations in Christ Himself and His eternal words of love and power. Beating up against the rocks of such a conviction the tempests of international hatred will break in vain. The structure that is built upon it may be very small but it will be founded on the rock. All building on that rock is part of the eternal building in which all nations and races shall each take a share, the temple of God into which all peoples shall come to worship. This is the faith of the Christian revolutionary for the world of nations.

CHAPTER XI
THE HEART OF THE MATTER

In our Lord's Day there seem to have been three classes of earnest-minded Jews. In one the tendency was to make the best of the existing world, to come to a compromise with Gentile culture and Gentile policy. Another class resigned themselves passively to evil, expecting a Divine deliverance. And yet another thought to co-operate with God by taking arms against their oppressors. Upon all these alike our Lord urges repentance. It is neither by compromise with evil, nor in passively suffering evil, nor by opposing force to evil, that men can expect good. It is by faith in God as the bestower of good, and by unswerving co-operation with this divine outflow of good to an evil world. This is the repentance and faith He looked for; and He was then disappointed.

LILY DOUGALL.

As a King sending a Son, He sent Him as King, He sent Him as God, He sent Him as Man to men; He was saving and persuading when He sent Him, not compelling, for compulsion is not an attribute of God; when He sent Him He was calling, not pursuing; when He sent Him He was loving, not judging.

EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

CHAPTER XI

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

I

“ GREAT social reforms always have been and always will be the result of great religious movements.” If these words of Mazzini’s are true it is surely high time there was a great religious movement. What is to be its character? Whence is it to arise? What shall be the signs of its coming? Is there anything that ordinary men and women can do to hasten it? These are some of the questions which it may be well to face before concluding one’s study of the Christian Revolution.

For after all it is a vain thing to sketch out a possible method of social progress if there be no adequate dynamic to carry it forward. One might as well build a power plant at the Falls of Foyers which only a Niagara could drive. There will be some who have read thus far and are still unconvinced. Either they may feel that what has been said is not very new or very revolutionary; or if they realise how much it means and how far it carries us they may say like the Chinese girl, “ We all know it’s quite impossible.” Both points of view are quite intelligible. There is nothing new under the sun, and very many have said and are saying the same kind of thing that has been put into this book. That is a cause of hope, because it shows some common spirit or thought-influence affecting many minds. The more support there is for our argument from other points of view, the more reason have we to feel that there is a truth in it which cannot be resisted. We are, moreover, so used to hearing true things said but only half meant that it is quite possible for the reader to feel that, after all, there is nothing very revolutionary in them.

They have worn channels in our minds without driving any machinery. The Falls of Niagāra ran to waste for no one knows how long. Not till some one put up machinery for applying the power did they mean more than an impressive and beautiful sight for the traveller. So it is with the mighty principles that we read in the Sermon on the Mount. They have been a beautiful picture for the religious sight-seer too long. Of course they have influenced many lives and even society as a whole. But they still wait to be applied in a way at all approaching to an adequate utilisation of their vast latent power for revolutionising society. The great difficulty of the writer or preacher is to convince people that one means what one says.

For the other type of mind which sees the immense implications of the Christian revolutionary method but is hopeless as to the possibility of advancing along this path, or advancing far enough or fast enough, the great need seems to be in the realm of what we call the spiritual. The story is told of a man of God who was surrounded by his foes and who prayed the Lord to open the eyes of his servant that he might see. When his eyes were opened he found that they two were not, as he had supposed, alone and defenceless but that "the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire."* It is a picture of the actuality of the unseen forces. We live in the midst of them and are not awake to them. "Dimly and faintly, hidden and afar" we at times perceive their true significance. But "the world is too much with us." We cannot rise above the material, and we feel that most other people are in like case. So we become cynical, or just save ourselves from cynicism by being somewhat illogical.

In the minds of many of us two thoughts struggle one against the other. In some moods we feel that only a power altogether outside ourselves can accomplish what is needed in this world.

* 2 Kings vi. 14-17.

We seem so helpless. "Oh that Thou wouldst rend the heavens that Thou wouldst come down."* is the unspoken prayer. We would gladly be spectator, if need be, of another flood, when all the wickedness of the world should be swept away. How can any human effort avail to do what is needed? We are utterly insignificant and may as well give up trying. Or rather, as we rise above despair our whole being seems to go out in a trustful longing that God would accomplish that which to us seems wholly impossible.

In other moods the passion to improve things takes hold of us. We feel that if we cannot make things better we have no right to live. We even feel that man's unconquerable will is enough, and that it would be a sign of weakness to turn to any outside power for assistance. If we cannot save ourselves and society neither we nor it deserve to be saved. We will not be craven. The words of John Galsworthy express our mood.

If on a spring night I went by
And God were standing there;
What is the prayer that I should pray
To Him? This is the prayer:
"Oh Lord of courage grave;
Oh Master of this night of spring;
Make firm in me a heart too brave,
To ask Thee anything."

Neither mood seems to me wholly right, and yet in each there is something splendid—the splendid faith of the trustful child and the splendid courage of the strong youth. Every great spiritual movement has in some sense combined the good in each of these moods, and so unified men's personalities in humility and confidence.

* Isa. xliv. 1. Note the answer to which the prophet found his way in verses 4-8.

II

Without attempting to give any complete reply to the questions with which I started this chapter, let me state seven convictions that bear upon the problem. They are concerned primarily with the character of the religious movement for which this age seems to me to stand in special need.

(1) It is necessary that the material conditions of life be frankly faced. To talk of spiritual revival as if it were solely concerned with men's feelings and inward experiences is to lose the chance of reaching great numbers whose circumstances press upon them so heavily as to give them very little power to think of their deeper needs. More important is the consideration that such a movement is not true to life. It makes a false division between secular and religious. It should never be forgotten that Jesus Christ devoted a large part of His time to healing the sick. Their sickness was a disability that made it hard for them to attend to His spiritual message. The conditions of overcrowding and casual employment and long hours of work are such a disability for very many to-day. It is an urgent duty to remove this if the spiritual message, is to be intelligible. But still deeper lies the fact that the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth is an integral part of our message and work. The Christian Revolution is needed to create a new social order. If as I hold, it is to come out of and through a new movement of the Spirit in human life, it is clear that this movement must have, as an integral part of its message, something about the material conditions of our social life. And this means that there must be no hiding of the facts. They are the raw material with which and upon which the new spirit has to work. To run away from them is not only folly, it is sin.

(2) The movement must fully recognise the spiritual side of man's nature. Better material conditions, however important, cannot satisfy. While they are being improved the men and women who are being

helped out of degrading circumstances need to be given the power to appreciate and use their new opportunities. Educational effort must therefore be an integral part of a religious movement that reaches out to these larger problems. Men have powers of appreciating and being lifted up by art, music, literature, but these powers in many lie latent and never give the enjoyment and richness to life for which they are designed, because they have not been awakened and led out into appropriate experiences. Such development will help to give a true sense of values and of proportion. We need no narrow concentration upon one aspect of life, but an all-roundness which means the growth of the whole personality. A religious movement that is adequate for these great purposes, then, must see life whole, and must grip the deepest things in men, showing them a reason for the improvement of conditions in the improvement of men and women. Otherwise the end will again be denied by the means and the improvement of conditions will mean the materialisation of life, the submergence of the soul.

(3) It is certain also that any religious movement which can meet our needs to-day must be fearless in the search for truth. The idea that organised religion is afraid of truth is fatal. However strongly we hold to the truth we have ourselves seen, we must be tolerant of others who differ from us, with the tolerance born not of easy-going indifference to truth, but of a passionate, though humble, determination to reach it, at whatever cost to prejudices or pride—the tolerance that consists in “the love of truth and the love of man, each brought to its perfection and living in perfect harmony with one another.”*

There is something relentless about truth. If we neglect it it comes back again and again until we are driven to accept it or die, intellectually if not spiritually. But a spiritual awakening is not a mere acceptance of truths that we cannot escape, it is an opening of the

* Philip Brooks on *Tolerance*, p. 25.

arms to welcome all truth ; it is the enthusiasm of a search for truth. The signs of the coming of the movement that is needed are to be seen where men patiently devote themselves to searching out the secrets of nature, not less perhaps, than where they gather together and sing hymns.

(4) The movement we need must also be marked by a larger sympathy. We must learn to speak and to understand one another's languages in more senses than one. We must get out of our cliques of like-minded persons and find a real fellowship with those of differing convictions. There must be a universal note in all our speaking and writing. Race prejudice must be transcended in a real community of spirit and in common effort. We must learn afresh how to put ourselves in the place of others. The righteous indignation that is fed upon ignorance, and can only flourish as we shut our eyes to the temptations and environment of our fellows, must give place to a reticence about the sins of others and a larger pity for those who are betrayed into errors that we may never have been tempted to commit. This sympathy will melt us into one. It will remove with a subtle hand the barriers that prevent many from speaking frankly to one another in love, and also the harshness that leads them to speak brutally. Where men sit apart and criticise their brethren we shall not be very likely to find the beginnings of our longed-for revival. "God loves those who make excuses for other people."

(5) The mark of moral earnestness is one that is equally important. No great thing has ever been done for the uplift of humanity by those who have been mere idle spectators of the game. When I see men who show this moral earnestness, who show that they do think it matters how they live or how others live, I feel far nearer to them, even though their creeds may be very different from mine, than to those who stand in the same circle of ideas as I do but who are not deeply moved by those ideas. Moral earnestness seems usually to spring

from repentance, a deep sense of the fact that one has missed the mark, and that one is involved in a society that has missed the mark partner in its guilt. "I am undone because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips."* But true repentance is not bewailing one's sins, it is rising up and sinning no more. It is a stepping out into a new life in determined effort to achieve. No spiritual movement that lacks moral earnestness can carry us very far.

(6) But there is something that goes even further, the note of high adventure. Repeatedly in these pages and elsewhere† I have urged that true religion is an adventure, and that it is only by daring experiments that we can advance. The motto "Safety first" may be all very well for the crowded streets of our cities, but it is not any use for the open highway of life. What good would it have been in the days when men were called to risk everything for their country? The best that men are capable of cannot be called out save in an enterprise whose end is in some sense uncertain and where dangers and difficulties abound. War, with all its horrors, has had a certain place in calling out the highest powers of endurance and self-sacrifice of which men are capable. If we turn from War what is to fill this function in human society?

"One of the arguments in favour of national wars is that more than anything else they cement national solidarity. This is because they represent group-action of the most strenuous and the most emotionalised type: actions and emotions that lie close to elemental instincts. The substitute for war that civilisation is to find must have as its major ingredient group-action that is strenuous and emotionalised. Wanting this there can be no effective and abiding national solidarity. The substitute need not equal war in its momentary power; for what it lacks in power may be made up

* Isa. vi. 5.

† See especially *Lay Religion*, Chapter IV.

in continuity of action.”* This means that the religious movement we seek must provide expression as well as impression, and that expression must not be simply in verbal statements, however valuable, but in attacking the great social evils we have been thinking of, and in adventuring together toward the creation of a better social order. We must enter in company upon the path of taking Christ seriously and that is adventure enough for anyone.

(7) No religious movement can meet the need that is not in some sense a new discovery of God, or a new revelation of Him whichever way we look at it. I believe this discovery will come as we see Him again in the face of Jesus Christ. I subscribe to the view that “the great central idea in our Lord’s life was that there is no wrath, no punishment, nothing destructive, nothing to fear in the Infinite.”† If we could see this with all the startling clearness with which our Lord Himself saw it, with all the vivid sense of its meaning that came to His first followers, a new day would surely dawn for mankind. It is love that is the creative power we need, and nothing in heaven or earth can take its place.

That love we see in the life and death of Jesus. Forgiveness is felt by some moderns to be a weakness in the Christian scheme of things.‡ It appears to encourage evil rather than to check it. But, rightly seen, forgiveness is central: it is the most distinctive thing in Christianity: it is her glory and her supreme power with which to overcome the world. Dare she use it? The unweaponed love of Jesus is set over against all antagonisms or hatreds. Is the infective power of goodness greater than that of evil? Only if the goodness be of this adventurous revolutionary type, if it be not a conventional acceptance of a moral

* Bobbett, *The Curriculum*, p. 132.

† *Practice of Christianity*, p. 86.

‡ See for example *All is One*, by Edmund Holmes, pp. 79 and 84.

code of restrictions, but the overflowing life of God in the soul. The actual power of God in human affairs is seen wherever human beings become the instruments of this love. It is by taking the course of adventure, danger, sacrifice in the simple confidence that God's love is supreme that we come, as in no other way, to the inward conviction that He is supreme, to the knowledge of all Reality.

III

There will be some who travel far along the same path that we have travelled in these pages, but who will be impatient at the constantly recurring religious or Christian note. To them it may savour of bigotry. Why not leave this out? After all, principles are the things that matter. Can we not find the same principles in socialism, in other religions, in various philosophies? We are with you, they will say, in all that you are really standing for, only we would express it very differently and we think you only put off many would-be followers by linking this all up with a metaphysical position that is not really a part of your philosophy of social progress.

Well and good. Let us by all means work together. Let us not boggle with words. Let us remember that the spirit is far more important than the way in which we express our faith. When we begin to use words as a means of reaching agreement we are about to fail, and may end in calling one another names.

Nevertheless I think there is more to be said for the method of treatment than such critics may be inclined to admit. I have found the inspiration and the understanding of true social progress in Jesus of Nazareth. It is a very long time since He saw the Way and told men of it. If others who are now feeling after a similar way do not acknowledge Him and do not even see Whom they ought to acknowledge, I believe they will be greatly

the losers, both because they will lack the victorious conviction that comes from Him and also because they will not be able to come back again and again to learn more from the real source. It is a dangerous thing to leave the original fountain and try to keep life going on the buckets of water that have been taken from it. To me it seems that many social workers are in this case. What they say and do is worthy of all admiration. They are standing for the things for which Jesus stands. We have no right to exclude them from the fellowship of His disciples, and even if they exclude themselves we are sorry.

But even in order to walk with them we may not suppress our own deepest conviction of truth. Those of whom I am speaking seem to me to lack something which both they and the world greatly need, and without which their efforts will not be wholly successful. It may be that the fault is largely that those of us who take the name of Christ are not standing for His principles as we should, or as well as some who do not take it. But wherever the fault lies the result is loss on both sides.

For after all, the Christian religion is something more than a set of principles. It started with a life lived among men in which those principles were perfectly expressed. It continues because that life is a continuous one, because the Cross was not the end, the collapse of all for which Jesus stood, but was followed by the resurrection, the vindication of His Way and the pledge and promise of that same life for all who take it. This life of God in the soul of man is the power that can overcome evil. Christianity stands for the reality of such a life. The Christian Church exists to bring men into this life. It is life alone that can conquer death, the eternal life which is found in the union of God and man. "This re-creative force, which is love's weapon and defence, the strong tower and the gleaming sword of the servant of God, is a power that we call supernatural. If we mean by

“supernatural” the higher nature that takes control of the lower nature it is a good word. As vegetable life turns mineral substance into life and growth; as animal life turns vegetable substance into instinct and intelligence; so the life of love turns the activities and institutions of antagonism into the activities and institutions of pure love. “This is the deed of God, and it is miraculous in our eyes.” It is not unnatural but it is the manifestation of an order of nature to which we have so little directed our attention that we are, as it were, just barely conscious of its existence.”*

It is the operation of this higher law, this life of love which is the life of God, in persons and so throughout society that is needed for the Christian revolution. Unless it operates the changes we have considered are not practicable. It is for this reason, above all others, that we need to turn again to Christ, that we need to find fellowship in worship as well as in work, that we need a quiet space in our own lives where we may find ourselves in communion with our Father. The revolution must begin in us, and it must continue to work in us. Mr. Wells, in somewhat pathetic words, says: “I have tried to let it become apparent that while I do firmly believe, not only in the splendour and nobility of the socialist dream, but in its ultimate practicability, I do also recognise quite clearly that with people just as they are now, with their prejudices, their ignorances, their misapprehensions, their unchecked vanities, greeds and jealousies, their untutored and misguided instincts, their irrational traditions no socialist state can exist, no better state can exist, than the one we have with all its squalor and cruelty.”† Yes, men and women are the raw material from which alone the new structure can be raised, and it is new men and women we need, and the work of Christ is first and foremost to create new men and women. Paul who had had so vivid an experience of this work wrote, “There is a new

* *Practice of Christianity*, pp. 281-2.

† *New Worlds for Old*, p. 203.

creation whenever a man comes to be in Christ ; what is old is gone, the new has come.”* This has been the testimony of very many since that day. The new man needed to make a new world can be created in this same way to-day.

Wherever society is approximating to the Christian ideal, wherever men are applying, consciously or unconsciously, those principles that we see in Christ, wherever the life of God is surging through men leading them to love their fellows, to seek the truth, to adventure for righteousness, there we trace the one purpose. This progressive application of the Way of Christ in human life is the one hope of so building that the structure will not collapse.

Surely, though the clouds hang low, we can see that there are many rifts. The prospect is not all dark. Patient souls keep alight the flame of love. The march of the children is ever toward the light, mothers hoping against hope for their straying sons, teachers giving themselves in their teaching, the poor helping others out of their poverty, the oppressed still keeping a sweet heart, the privileged devising means for surrendering their privileges, those who are called enemies drawing near in love, master and servant bound together in truest friendship, all who have resisted the passion for gain, all who have spent themselves in the service of others, all who follow truth with a single heart, they who experiment towards a new social order, they who build up an international fellowship—are they not part of the multitude whom no man can number, whose eyes are turned towards the dawn and whose hearts are tuned to the heavenly music? The spiritual movement for which we long is already on the way. How it will take shape, whereunto it will grow, none can tell. But the great confidence we have as we think back over the argument of this book is that the Christian revolution is already working, and that what we need is patience and faith and high endeavour, patience that we be not

* 2 Cor. v. 17 (Moffatt).

rushed into methods that are at most a second best and at worst foredoomed to failure ; faith in God as He is working in human affairs and as we find Him in our fellow-men, and faith in them too, without whom we cannot be made perfect ; high endeavour that our lives may be so lived that God can do great things even through us.

IV

I want to close this volume with a question. I have tried to state what I believe to be the Christian method of social progress. I have tried to show what it involves in regard to certain specific problems, although it is no less evident to myself than to the reader that I have not covered more than a very small portion of the ground. The value of the second part of this volume is rather that we can make concrete as we look at our problems one by one, what kind of action the full acceptance of these principles might be expected to lead into. I am very far from seeking rigidly to uphold, in each case, the detailed conclusions to which I have been led or from thinking that my main thesis fails if some of these conclusions have to be modified. But I do feel that the main contention ought to be faced both by Christians and by those who do profess to take the Christian standpoint.

My question takes a somewhat different form for these two classes. To those who call themselves Christians I would put it thus. Is this the distinctively Christian way ? Does it involve less trust in politics and none in violence ? Does it mean that the Church, and in a measure the individual Christian, has a specific contribution to the problem of social betterment, and that to turn from it into other and perhaps easier ways is to forsake the way our Master took and to betray Him and the world He came to save ? Is it true that the Church has come to be regarded as irrelevant when great

matters of social reform are under discussion? Is this due to the fact that we have departed from the way of Christ, to our compromise with evil and to our hesitation to take Christ seriously? Are we to-day prevented by convention, by commitments to governments, by relation to the capitalistic system, by our glorifying of war, from any forthright utterance on many of our gravest social evils. Was the despised conscientious objector nearer to seeing the way of Christ (in spite of all his mistakes and our misunderstanding of him) than those who, painfully it may be, but deliberately upheld the war? Is there a way of escape if we have gone wrong? Dare we take it? What will happen if we do not?

To my friends who do not make the Christian faith their starting-point may I put my question rather in this form. Have you, by taking Christianity only from us poor Christians, missed something supremely important for your work of social reconstruction? Do you find all the power and inspiration you need both for yourself and those among whom you work? Have you taken pains to see where your principles have their root, and is it possible that they come from Jesus of Nazareth? In seeking for a new social order by methods that are not His are you really arriving? Could you not help some of us who want to be Christians but have not seen nearly all it means to discover more of the implications of our faith and to apply it with more courage? Is the method of violence going to achieve the ends you have in view? Is it creative? If not, how are you going to resist the temptation to use it when there is the utmost provocation?

And for all of us together may we not ask ourselves again, can we not, must we not, join forces, granting each to the other full liberty to hold and express his deepest convictions, but so united that the forces of reaction, antagonism, private-mindedness, stubborn resistance to all change may be overcome through love and love alone?

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

The following notes prepared by a Group of teachers give some idea of one way of working out the ideas in Chapter VII. A school inspired by these ideals has been founded at Gland, Canton de Vaud, Switzerland.

NOTES ON A FELLOWSHIP SCHOOL

THE AIM

Acknowledging in Jesus Christ the highest and fullest life in human frame, and deeming it to be the will of God that each child should grow into His likeness ; it shall be the aim of the school through its daily life and teaching :

1. To encourage the reverent quest for Truth and Beauty, allowing a free and unfettered experience of the facts of life and nature and abundant access to the best thought from all ages and sources ;
2. To give opportunities for the achieving of Self-Discipline, using the best results of educational thought and practice, especially of recent experiments in freedom and self-government.
3. To reveal the possibilities of Fellowship and the joy of mutual service in this threefold aim, all knowledge is esteemed for its life value and its social worth, the demarcation between sacred and secular is denied, the daily social life of the community is not separated from the acquisition of knowledge, and education is regarded as a means to larger service.

While by the absence of compulsion and the pressure which seeks to mould the children to current standards of thought and practice, it is hoped to give the widest room for the development of their personality in every direction ; it shall be the aim especially to mediate to them the redeeming power of love as revealed in the life and death of Jesus Christ.

For the true understanding of Jesus Christ, it is recognised that the only teaching which will suffice is that which is

consistently borne out in the daily practical life of the community. But in as far as the everyday life is directed in His Spirit and in accord with His teachings it may be the means by which the children may grow up to be centres for the renewing of fellowship between nations, classes and churches, and may discover what is the true Christian message for society to-day.

THE SCHOLARS

In accordance with the ideal of fellowship, the scholars will be of all ages, all classes, rich and poor, of different denominations, and at least a few children of other nations. The aim will be to give a continuous and unending education over the range from Preparatory School to University age.

THE GOVERNMENT

Internal.—Shall be increasingly democratic, scholars and teachers sharing both legislation and administration.

External.—A Council representing :—

Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The School Staff.

The Scholars

together with co-opted experts.

SOME FEATURES OF THE SCHOOL

Site in or near a country village.

Number of children from 20 to 100.

Residential.

Co-educational.

Neighbourhood life to be a strong feature, the children sharing as much as possible in the life of the village.

Local craftsmen to help where possible in the life of the school.

Simple living, and with the greatest possible reverence for order, beauty and health.

All must share, teacher and scholar alike, in the labour that lies at the basis of human life and unites all men through their common need.

Every child to be trained to become self-supporting in the best sense.

The kitchen, crafts-room and garden to rank equally with the class room.

A small farm would be the most appropriate setting for the school.

Wealth to be recognised as a greater risk than poverty.

Service to be considered a greater thing than success.

The children will be encouraged to take part in the ordering of corporate religious worship, the practice of silence not being forgotten.

Loyalty to their own religious communion will be encouraged.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THE CURRICULUM

The method of a school has to be related :

1. to the nature of a child ;
2. to the world within which it has to live and choose its sphere of activity.

These two factors should give unity to the curriculum and to the manner of presentation. It is an essential part of the aim to present knowledge as a means to a fuller and richer life in the real world rather than as an end in itself.

1. *A child is a growing plant.* We may tend and water, but " God giveth the increase."

Therefore we must :

- (a) give freedom to the child to grow along the lines of its natural activities.
- (b) provide the food and material for the exercise of these activities.

Among these activities we may mention :

Observation of the world around.

The desire to know why.

The appreciation of harmony and beauty.

The faculty of wonder.

The desire to construct and create.

The desire for fellowship.

The need for physical exercise.

The need for opportunities for meditation.

The school sets out to encourage all these and to keep the spirit sensitive in all directions.

2. *The world into which the children have to enter is an imperfect world, in which there is discord between classes, nations and churches. The children will have their part to play in restoring fellowship and creating it where it is not. The school, therefore, sets before itself, as the ideal of citizenship, the power to restore and to create fellowship. This is a spiritual ideal which may be realised in any sphere of activity to which the child may go. It is "the Kingdom of God within you."*

At the same time the freedom and self-government of the community should lead to a greater understanding of the practice of social life and so make the scholars useful in the bringing of "*the Kingdom of God on earth*" in a better social order.

APPENDIX B

THE BRETHREN OF THE COMMON TABLE

are a company of men and women who are united in the belief that love, as revealed in the life and death of Jesus, is the sole basis of human society.

They take for their guidance the fact that the Son of God, while the shadows of death gathered round Him, set up, in the midst of a world consumed by the greed of wealth and harassed by the fear of poverty, a Common Table.

That Table stands as a token of the Divine Brotherhood and brings to view the overflowing life and riches of God to the world in Jesus Christ. In this vision man is raised above both greed and fear and thus removed from all occasions of strife. But the life of God can be received only as we share the gifts of His love, since God is made known to us through the sacrament of fellowship. It is in giving that we receive.

The Brotherhood accepts the responsibility of sharing the divine life with all. The Brethren recognise that they are called upon to spend themselves in the effort to deliver men from the fear and greed that lead to strife, so that at last, in every sphere of life, individual, social, industrial, international, love may prevail over greed and violence, and fear give way to a calm trust in the efficiency of God for all our needs.

But it is not enough to share the spiritual gifts of God. As the Epistle of Barnabas puts it "*Thou shalt communicate in all things with thy neighbour ; thou shalt not call things thine own ; for if ye are communicants in the things that cannot pass away how much more in the things that can ?*"

We therefore consider it obligatory to be prepared to share, in the spirit of Christ, with all according to their needs, recognising that in the Kingdom of God there are no private possessions but that he has the greatest right to the bounty of God who has the greatest need.

DIRECTIONS

The Brotherhood shall be open to all both men and women who accept the belief that love as revealed in the life and death of Jesus Christ is the sole basis of society.

There shall be no other test or questioning as to the fitness of an applicant for the Brotherhood.

(If any should join us from a sense of gain let us accept them gladly in the knowledge that only by such acceptance can we lay claim to the title "Brethren" and in the faith that such a one can be redeemed by the manifestation of love and fellowship.)

All shall be open to choose their place of residence and mode of life provided such service expresses the aim of the Brotherhood.

The Brethren shall assemble together in Chapter and frankly make known to each other their needs and means so that each may be in a position to supply, in the spirit of Christ, what the other lacks. As far as its resources permit the Brotherhood shall be responsible for seeing that none of its members are wanting in the means of living suitable to their requirements.

The Chapter or Meeting of the Brethren shall be held every three months at a house or place where they may be guests of one another.

Chapters shall be formed for different districts remaining mutually dependent one on the other so that one Chapter, incapable of supplying the needs of its brethren, may apply to any other Chapter for help.

The statement in Chapter of each brother's needs and resources shall alone be obligatory on the Brethren. What each shall contribute shall be in the nature of a free gift. The aim of the Brethren is to extend their help to all who are in need and not merely to those within the Brotherhood.

The order itself shall be incapable of possessing wealth in any form. The exchange of poverty and abundance between the Brethren shall take place in Chapter after all have made known what they need and what they can share.

A Chapter Clerk shall be appointed every year to record and to put into effect the will of the Brethren and also to convey their help in the case of any unexpected need arising between the meetings of the Chapter.

The Brethren shall be free to worship each in his own way and none shall be asked to take part against his will in any form of common worship. Members shall not be bound to the Brotherhood by any promise and shall be free at any time to leave the Order.

THE WORK OF THE ORDER

The primary concern of the Order is to perfect the life of the individual by providing a way in which each may learn to share with others the material as well as the Spiritual gifts of God and so enter more fully into the Kingdom of Heaven.

While to some this will mean bringing the spirit of brotherhood to bear on the ordinary relationships and daily duties of life, others may be led to devote their lives to proclaiming the Gospel of the Kingdom by preaching and by personal contact with their fellow men either at home or in foreign countries. The maintenance of such brethren shall constitute a claim on the Brotherhood.

The Brethren, who have already found a way of life and means of earning their living, can offer their homes as rest houses and places of call for those who are led to go on foot throughout the country preaching a new order of society founded on the love of Jesus.

A still further form of service is open to those, who, through the mystery of art, can reveal the beauty and joy of simple ordinary things. For the majority of the workers of the world the Temple of Beauty has been closed. It is for those who have the power to unlock the doors for the people so that they may enter into their heritage.

Among the directions for founding a Chapter, are the following :—

Since Christian fellowship is essentially sacramental, in that it expresses spiritual union in economic terms, the primary concern of a Chapter is for its members to attain to that sense of union with one another, in which a sharing of material things is the natural expression of such a fellowship.

When the first followers of Jesus met around " The Common Table " in the Upper Room at Jerusalem they were already a company of friends united in the Person of their Divine Master. If the Brethren of the Common Table are to attain to this company they must be willing to spend some days together seeking the same fellowship. This will no doubt present almost insurmountable difficulties, but they must be faced if any lasting fellowship is to be arrived at; where a longer time is impossible a meeting might be arranged for a Saturday afternoon to continue throughout Sunday.

A further consideration is the need of silence. One of the hindrances to all fellowship is that few are capable of maintaining and expressing their real personality in the company of others; we are ourselves least of all in our social intercourse, with the result that social life is often unreal and unrelated to the personality of each individual. We have to

be silent with one another before we can attain to that degree of consciousness where truth becomes possible. It is well therefore to arrange for some rule of silence, or rather freedom from mere conversation, so that, when the Brethren meet in Chapter, each in the deepened consciousness of his own personality, may be able to enter more fully into the lives of others.

Again the actual sharing of food has a spiritual value and is in the nature of a sacrament which unites men to one another. In all meetings of the Brotherhood the sharing of food should be an essential part ; this common meal may be provided by one of the Brethren acting as host or by a contribution from all the members, each bringing something or being responsible in turn for separate meals.

And so forth.

APPENDIX C

*Findings of the Forum of Social and Industrial Questions
at the Conference of the World's Student Christian Federation,
held at Peking, April, 1922*

WHAT JESUS CHRIST MEANS FOR THE LIFE OF TO-DAY

The life of Jesus was utterly dedicated to the creation of a new order (the Kingdom of God), in which the family relationship, under God our Father, would be worked out in every department of life. This new order was to come through the creative activity of loving men and women, in harmony with one another and in conscious dependence upon God. Jesus stated his programme thus :

To preach the Gospel to the poor.

To proclaim release for captives and recovery of sight for the blind.

To set free the oppressed.

In seeking to work out this programme we may note that :

1. Jesus was supremely concerned with persons, far more than with things or even with reforms. He thought it worth while to make children happy, to talk to an alien woman, to spend time with ignorant fishermen, to help social outcasts. None were too poor or insignificant for his personal interest and help.

Therefore :

We are to be interested in each one and study his needs as a person whom we must respect and never despise.

We cannot be satisfied as long as any are neglected or oppressed.

We must strive for education that will develop personality. We must seek to secure leisure for all to develop their minds and souls.

As industry is organised increasingly, especially in the Far East, we must prevent labour from becoming an intolerable burden to the worker.

For the criminals, beggars, defectives, we must provide conditions that give them possibilities of becoming useful members of the community.

IN SUCH WAYS WE MAY EXPRESS SOCIAL JUSTICE BASED
ON RECOGNITION OF HUMAN WORTH

2. Jesus behaved towards all as if they were already his brothers and was never held back by distinctions of race, class or sex. The Jews hated the Samaritans, but Jesus healed and helped them: he mixed with rulers and peasants; he gave new hope to the fallen woman because he believed in her.

Therefore :

We must bring to an end all that keeps men apart.

We must stand for the highest ideal of woman, her freedom, and her equality with man.

We must form a world family where race prejudice has no place.

Those of us whose economic advantage gives us power over the lives of others must be ready to surrender such advantage for the sake of closer fellowship.

We must see that the great chasm separating employer from employed in the more industrialised countries is not allowed to develop in the less forward.

We cannot be finally satisfied with such a division in society, and must seek to bring all who work in any industry together in some form of joint ownership and control of the property they use for their service to the community.

Thus we may help all to be masters of their own lives and also servants of the community working together.

SUCH ARE STEPS TOWARDS TRUE UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD
EXPRESSED IN CO-OPERATION

3. Jesus spent a great deal of time in practical service for the community, and in helping individuals who sought his assistance. He spent a large part of his life in the carpenter's shop; he healed many who were diseased: he fed the hungry.

Therefore :

Our lives must be lives of service.

We must give our best not to gain wealth but to serve our fellows whether by economic production, teaching, healing or in any other way.

We must seek for such social changes that production may be for service not for profit, and men shall be released from the toil of making superfluities.

We must recognise the health of men's bodies as a matter of real concern, seeking to create a public conscience in sanitation and other preventive measures.

THESE ARE EXAMPLES OF SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY EXPRESSED IN SERVICE

4. Jesus, for the sake of his ideal, lived a life of love towards all men, and because he would not abandon that way in a world like this, he went bravely to death with his eyes open, despising the shame. He went on trusting the disciple who was defrauding him and would, he knew, betray him; he forgave his murderers and did not retaliate; he never tried to escape the consequences of his acts of love, although they were leading him direct to the cross.

Therefore :

We must accept the risks of loving men always in a world by no means ready for such action.

We must be prepared to be imposed upon, misunderstood and reviled without losing heart, and let our love increase to overcome the evil.

If for example the business in which we earn our living is immoral we must change it at whatever cost even if it should mean bankruptcy. If we hold an office where corruption is a part of the routine, we must take the consequences of uncompromising opposition, even if we lose our post.

If any of us see the way of Jesus to be utterly contrary to all war, they must spare no strength to root war out of international life, and may have to refuse themselves to take part in it, even if they are shot for their refusal.

We must make it our aim to embody the spirit of Christ in all social activities, even if it seem quixotic or futile.

THESE ARE EXAMPLES OF CREATIVE LOVE IN ACTION

These are some of the principles of the new social order. They are tremendously revolutionary—far more so than Bolshevism. This Christian revolution proceeds through reconciliation. It is a great adventure. It means living dangerously. It needs men and women utterly convinced that God is like what we see in Jesus, absolutely loving, and who

are prepared to trust Him without reserve. It can achieve what we all most deeply desire in our best moments.

The very statement of these principles convicts us, who state them of our own share in this imperfect society both actively and as we have consented to evil by our silence. But it also commits us to an unrelenting warfare against social ills and the purifying of our own lives in order that we may take our place in creating a world family.

Our idea of the Christian Church includes the belief that it is meant to be an instrument in bringing about this Christian Revolution, and in helping all its members to join therein. We wish to give ourselves to following Jesus in thus serving our fellows.

APPENDIX D

Since the Chapter dealing with Industrial Experiments was written I have come into touch with the group concerned in the following plan. Although very little has yet been done, a beginning has been made along a new line. I think this experiment more nearly embodies the ideal for which I am pleading in this volume than any other that has yet been made of which I have any knowledge. I therefore put the scheme in full in the Appendix.

THE SERVANTS OF THE CHURCH

1. (a) The Communion which is to carry out this plan is to be called "THE SERVANTS OF THE CHURCH."

(b) To this Communion may be admitted after preparation any who intends to share continuously in its work and life, as industrial worker, donor or lender, councillor, preacher, or in any other capacity recognised in the plan, and who takes the ring which is the symbol of this Communion making publicly a promise in the form following: I promise in the presence of God and of you my brothers that while I share in this Communion I will work for the glory of God, for the love of Jesus and for my fellow men.

(c) In any place may be formed local Communions within the whole Communion whose rule is to be the Directions of the Brethren of the Common Table or any other way of true sharing recognised by the whole Communion, and into these may be admitted, besides ordinary members of this Communion persons who cannot share continuously in the work and life of the whole Communion and who make the promise in the form prescribed.

2. (a) All capital needed under the plan is to be raised and allotted by a body, to be called the Industrial Council of the Church in Cornwall, consisting of:

- i. At least twelve persons chosen, each for one year, by annual gatherings of the Church in Cornwall, the method of choosing them to be fixed with regard to the principle that there should be representation of

various bodies within the Church as well as of the Christian community as a whole, and as many more as may be necessary to keep the number so chosen equal to that of the members nominated under the next clause.

- ii. Three persons nominated by each Board of Management formed under section VIII (a) as soon as it has been allotted capital by the Council.

(b) The Council is to provide for reducing its membership in proper proportion when its numbers exceed (say) thirty.

3. (a) The annual gatherings of the Church in Cornwall are to be open to all citizens of the county who are members or desirous of becoming members of this Communion, the various bodies within the Church in Cornwall so willing being represented officially by their leaders or other accredited representatives, such representatives being members or desirous of becoming members of this Communion.

(b) At each of these gatherings there is to be a service of dedication in which all those present wishing to be enrolled are to make the promise of service and to be enrolled in this Communion.

(c) The annual gatherings after the first are to be summoned by the Industrial Council.

4. (a) The Industrial Council is to have legal status under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1893—1913, and the status of its members is to be secured on the lines adopted in the case of the Committee of the Guild of Builders—each member to hold a shilling share and deposit with his nominators a signed open transfer.

(b) The relevant parts of this plan, redrafted in proper form, are to constitute the rules of the Society so formed. Some of these rules are to be distinguished as fundamental and such rules may only be altered with the consent of the annual gathering of the Church.

(c) The Industrial Council is to be empowered to act through an Executive Committee on which the members nominated under Section II. (a) i. and Section II. (a) ii. respectively are to be represented proportionately.

(d) The Industrial Council is to bring into existence an independent Advisory Committee of technical and business experts whose function will be to give advice when consulted and to tender it at any time.

(e) The Industrial Council may pay its members or the members of the Advisory Committee compensation for out-of-pocket expenses and for loss of time incurred in connection with their meetings.

(f) The Industrial Council for the first year of its existence and for such further period as it may determine is to defray all its administrative expenses from a special fund raised for that purpose.

5. (a) The Industrial Council is to be empowered to receive from individuals and parishes, congregations or other groups loans and free gifts for the purpose of financing self-governing co-operative industrial ventures in Cornwall undertaken in a spirit of brotherhood.

(b) No person or group making a gift or loan to the Industrial Council is to acquire thereby any controlling interest in the Council or in any venture financed by the Council.

(c) No loan may be secured on the assets of any venture financed under the plan.

(d) The Industrial Council may form a guarantee fund.

(e) The time of repayment of any loan is to be determined by the Industrial Council.

Note.—The intention of the plan is that the Industrial Council should ordinarily raise loans on its general credit without giving legal security and should ask at the outset for loans to be made out of the lender's surplus funds. Sub-section (e) is technically necessary to prevent what would be equivalent to "a run on the bank." It does not prevent the Council using sub-section (d) to make special arrangements with individual lenders.

6 (a) The Industrial Council is not to raise loans bearing interest except as an emergency measure to meet circumstances such as those defined in Section II of the following note.

Note (i.) This provision is not meant to place the ventures financed under this plan in an artificially favoured economic position in competing with other ventures; see Section VII (iv.) and Section XV, note.

(ii.) It is contemplated that the plan should be set working by free gifts and loans not bearing interest and that the profits of the industries financed under it should come back (under Section XV) to the Industrial Council to be used for the purpose of further extending the ventures

and that the surplus funds accumulating will be sufficient for future capital requirements.

The question of raising capital at interest can, therefore, only arise, if at all, under exceptional circumstances such as a sudden crisis in a venture during the period before the surplus fund has had time to accumulate.

(b) The Industrial Council before raising loans bearing interest is to adopt rules providing that

- i. interest is payable up to a low maximum rate which may vary with the state of the money market but not with the profits of the ventures financed
- ii. interest may not be paid out of the non-interest-bearing funds of the Council and the provisions of Section V (c) apply to the guaranteeing of interest as well as of capital
- iii. the interest-bearing loans are to be redeemable at any time and are to be redeemed as soon as circumstances seem to the Industrial Council to warrant it
- iv. the proceedings of the Industrial Council and Boards of Management in connection with interest-bearing funds are not to be exempted from any provisions of the plan.

7. The Industrial Council is to be empowered to allot capital, either in a lump sum or in instalments, to a specified amount for a specified period, to be administered by a Board of Management, constituted as provided in Section VIII (a), which

- i. applies for capital to finance a venture or ventures of the kind described in Section 5 (a)
- ii. undertakes for its part to carry through the venture or ventures as agreed, subject to the provisions of Section 14
- iii. submits with its application a three-fold scheme as provided in Section 10 (a)
- iv. satisfies the Council that the proceeds of the venture or ventures are likely at least to support all the workers at a proper standard of living during the specified period and, with allowance for the capitalised value of the land equipment rights and goodwill in the hands of the Board of Management at the end of the specified period, are reasonably likely also to repay an amount equivalent to the original sum with compound interest reckoned at a commercial rate.

8. (a) Every Board of Management is to be composed of
- i. not less than four or more than seven persons chosen, by methods to be determined, by a defined group of members of this Communion, which group must comprise all the workers (including the necessary technical and administrative staff) regularly employed in the venture or ventures directed by the Board and may comprise all the members of this Communion engaged in a particular industry or all the members in a given area or any other group of members having a defined relation to the venture or ventures in question
 - ii. persons nominated by the Industrial Council, to number not more than half those chosen under the preceding clause.

(b) A Board of Management controlling two or more distinct industrial ventures may delegate its administrative functions in respect of any venture to a subordinate Board constituted as it thinks fit.

9. (a) The first charge upon the funds held by a Board of Management is to be the maintenance, in sickness and health and during any temporary stoppage of work, of all the workers so long as they are employed in the venture or ventures directed by the Board, and the gradual formation of a pension fund.

(b) The rates and amounts payable may be on a sliding scale based on the cost of living but not on a sliding scale based on the proceeds of the industry. This clause is not to preclude a scheme of remuneration under which a mean rate is fixed and the workers may accept less during an emergency and proportionately more later for a limited period.

(c) The rates and amounts payable and the hours worked are commonly to be based on Trade Union rates and hours where such exist.

(d) At frequent meetings for worship for all the workers and members of the Board of each venture there are to be opportunities for all to state their needs and to share with one another.

10. (a) In applying to the Industrial Council for capital a Board of Management is to submit a scheme setting out

- i. the constitution of the venture or ventures, including the composition and constitution of the group of members of this Communion which shares in the election of the Board of Management, the method of electing and recalling the Board, the nature of the powers

exercised by the Board over the workers and the relation of the Board to its subordinate Boards.

- ii. the rates and amounts payable to the workers and the hours to be worked.
- iii. the industrial operations proposed and an approximate budget of expenditure including the amount (if any) which may be taken out of proceeds for capital expenditure and the amount which be set aside for depreciation.

(b) This scheme when accepted by the Industrial Council is to define the conditions on which capital is allotted to the Board of Management but may be varied with the consent of the Industrial Council.

(c) Within the limits of the scheme and subject to the provisions of Section 11 the Board of Management is to be empowered to expend at its discretion both the capital allotted to it and the proceeds of the venture or ventures which it directs.

(d) The Industrial Council may call for reports from a Board of Management and make suggestions to it.

11. (a) The Industrial Council is to retain the ownership of the capital allotted to a Board of Management, and all land equipment leases and rights acquired by a Board are to be acquired in the name of the Industrial Council, but the Industrial Council is not to be thereby entitled to interfere with the discretion given to a Board of Management under Section 10 (c).

(b) A Board of Management is not to raise capital either by gift or in any other way from any other source than from the Industrial Council.

(c) A Board of Management is not to incur liabilities which cannot be met out of its unspent capital.

(d) A Board of Management may not lend money but is to return capital which it cannot for the time being use (and which is in excess of what is needed for its current account) to the Industrial Council to be returned by the Council on demand.

[(e) A clause is required providing for the legal status of a Board of Management under which, without owning the capital and equipment of any venture, it is both legally free and in practice unhampered in exercising the administrative control vested in it and liable at law for its own actions.]

12. The accounts of Boards of Managements and of each separate venture are to be open to the inspection of the Industrial Council or its agent and the Council is to provide for a system of periodical accounting under which the financial

position of every venture shall be ascertained and made public quarterly or as often as the Council may direct.

Note.—This last provision is meant (i.) to enable Boards of Management to know how far the ventures they direct are year by year earning the ordinary returns of industry (ii.) to create public confidence (iii.) to provide a true basis for prices.

13. The Industrial Council may, upon application being made to it as provided in Section 7, allot additional capital to any Board of Management during the period specified in the original scheme.

14. If, during the specified period a Board of Management becomes financially unable to carry out its original scheme and the Industrial Council does not exercise its powers under Sections 10 (*b*) and 13, the funds land and equipment at that time held by the Board are to revert to the Industrial Council which is to administer whatever pension fund has been accumulated under Section 9 (*a*) and is empowered to make further provision for the workers in the venture whether able-bodied or incapacitated.

15. (*a*) At the end of the period specified in its original scheme all funds and assets in the hands of a Board of Management are to revert to the Industrial Council, less any funds and assets which may be allotted by the Industrial Council to the Board as its capital for a further specified period, on a further scheme being submitted to the Industrial Council.

(*b*) At the time of this transaction the Industrial Council is to obtain an independent valuation of the assets of the venture, including land equipment rights and goodwill.

Note.—It is presumed that in an ordinarily successful venture the amount so refunded to the Industrial Council at the end of the specified period will be roughly equivalent to the original capital repaid with compound interest at the current commercial rate, less the capitalised value of land equipment, rights and goodwill; but the section does not oblige a Board of Management to refund this amount if it has failed to secure so large a profit, nor entitle it to keep profits over and above that amount.

16. (*a*) The Industrial Council is to be empowered to use part of the funds returned to it by Boards of Management.

i. to come to the assistance of individuals and parishes, congregations or other groups within or without the

County who may be in urgent need, it being understood that this assistance cannot be claimed by any such individual or group on the ground that he or it has contributed by gift or loan to the funds of the Industrial Council.

- ii. to enable the Boards of Management to raise the rates and amounts allotted under Section 9 to the maintenance of the workers and to provide amenities for the workers and facilities for their technical training and other education, provided that all the ventures benefit equally so far as possible.
- iii. to promote education and research for the improvement of industries and to establish such accounting, costing and other services not directly remunerative as the Council may wish to provide for the general benefit of the ventures financed by it.

(b) In using funds under this Section the Industrial Council is to be satisfied that the object is more urgent than the allotment of these funds as capital to fresh or existing industrial ventures with the standard of maintenance accepted by it until then.

INDEX

*For detailed reference to main subjects, home, school, church, etc.,
see the analytical contents.*

- Abercrombie, Lascelles, *Sale of St. Thomas*, 95.
Abstract thinking, 40.
Aims of the School, 170-2.
 Fulfilment of these, 172-7.
A. Nash Co., 225.
Anatole France, 247.
Asquith, H. H., 268.
Association, 81.
Atlee, T. S., *Man and His Buildings*, 233.
- Barnardo, Dr., 242.
Bernhardi, 38.
Birth control, 147.
Bobbitt, 180, 286.
Bolshevism, 238.
Brailsford, H. N., *A League of Nations*, 249.
Brethren of the Common Table, 204, 264, Appendix C.
Brooks, Phillips, 283.
Browning, Robert :
 " A Death in the Desert," 37.
 " A Grammarian's Funeral," 125.
By an Unknown Disciple, 40, 150, 166, 194.
- Cadoux, C. J. :
 The Early Christian Attitude to War, 78, 208, 251, 252-3.
 An Appeal to the people of the Christian Church, 118.
 The Guidance of Jesus for To-day, 254.
- Cairns, David S., 79-80.
Capital punishment, 112.
Churches, The :
 Attitude of, towards Social Reconstruction, 24.
 Indictment of the Church, 34.
 Indictment of Current Christianity, 37, 38.
 Impotence, 119.
Church, The, 187, 188.
 As representative of Christ, 189, 190.
- The fellowship of, 191.
 The work of, 200.
 Needs of, 209, 211.
Child, the, 163, 164, 165.
Civilisation, Failure of Western, 22.
 Causes of Failure, 32, 33.
 Something worse than disclosure of failure, 37.
Clarifying the issue, 128.
Class-thinking, 39.
Clutton-Brock, A., 162.
Coates, J. R., *The Christ of Revolution*, 51.
Coercion, 110-112, 119.
Commercial efficiency, 178.
Conscientious Objectors, position taken by, 117, 209, 257, 292.
Co-operation, 179.
Creative instinct, 167.
- Davies, J. Langdon, *Militarism in Education*, 180.
Dewey, J. and E., 176.
Diognetus, 278.
Direct appeal, 126.
Disarmament, 126, 271.
Divorce, 154, 156.
Domination, Spirit of, 42, 88, 131.
Dougall, Lily, 40, 52, 70, 91, 138, 151, 158, 278, 286, 289.
Dream, the, 47, 54.
 The Dream, Creative, 64, 125, 140, 258.
Duelling, 250.
Dunkerley, R. and E., *The Arm of God*, 79, 115, 272.
Dymond, Jonathan, 246.
- Economic System, 217.
Education, 163, 169, 283.
Epistle from London Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, 66.

- Eucken, Rudolph, 216.
 Experiments, 92, 135, 156, 157,
 167, 202, 203, 204, 205, 210,
 211.
 In Pemba, 127-128.
 A. Nash Co., 225, 239.
 Holy Experiment, 254, 255.
 Criminal Children, 264.
 Austrian children in English
 Homes, 265.
 Esnes, 266.
 Exploitation, 25, 177.
- Faber, F. W., 51.
 Family, the :
 The kingdom a family, 55,
 56, 61, 140, 145.
 Relation to God, 150, 179.
 The family spirit, 202.
 Outward changes not enough,
 224.
 Loyalty to, 258.
 New vision of world, 261.
- Fellowships :
 Anglican, 84.
 Free Church, 84.
 Fellowship of Reconciliation,
 84, 264.
 No-Conscription, 259.
 Brotherhood in Christ, 264.
- Forgiveness, 286.
 Förster, Prof., 274-275.
 Forsyth, P. T., *The Christian
 Ethic of War*, 79.
 Francis of Assisi, 203.
 Friends' Emergency Committee,
 259.
- Galsworthy, John, 281.
 Garden City Trusts, 231.
 Ghandi, 237.
 Glasgow Student Conference,
 Extract, 20.
 Golden Rule, the, 209, 225.
 Goodness, Individual idea of, 41.
 Graham, J. W., *Conscription and
 Conscience*, 259.
- Guilds :
 Of the Middle Ages, 86, 87,
 230.
 Building Guilds, 235.
 Guild Socialism, 236-237, 240.
- Halliday, W. F., *Reconciliation
 and Reality*, 51.
 Hampton, 175.
 Hard-heartedness, 39, 158.
 Hobhouse, Mrs. Henry, *I appeal
 unto Cæsar*, 259.
 Hobhouse, L. H., *Property, its
 duties and rights*, 221.
 Hodgkin, H. T. :
 Walker Essay, 55, 56.
 Swarthmore Lecture, 1912, 90.
 Article in *Venturer*, 182.
 Articles in *The Pilgrim* on
 "Church Unity."
Lay Religion, 48, 49, 74, 87,
 132, 151, 155, 188-189, 194,
 195, 285.
 Hodgkin, L. V., 198.
 Holmes, Edmund, 286.
 Howard, E. F., *Friends' Service
 in War-time*, 260.
- Imagination, Lack of, 42.
 Independent Judgment, 178.
 Industrial Council in the Build-
 ing Industry, 233, 264.
 Infection, 88, 96.
 Inquisition, 39.
 International relations, 210.
 International Peace, 254.
 Irish question, 266, 270.
 Irwin, Will, *The Next War*,
 35.
- James, William, 44, 53, 122.
 Japan, 182, 210, 211, 271.
 Jones, Rufus M., *The Remnant*,
 78, 192, 251.
- Keynes, J. Maynard, *Economic
 Consequences of the Peace*,
 56.
 Kidd, Benjamin, 105.
 Kikuyu, 198.
 Kingdom of God : 154, 178,
 192, 193, 197, 253, 263, 282.
 Practical politics of, 24.
 Supreme Ruler, our Father, 55.
 Set up in men's hearts, 57.
 Set up in this world, 59.
 Can be realised soon, 59.
 Contingent on human effort,
 60.

- Retarded, 75.
Korea, 182.
- Labour Party, 123.
League of Nations, 123, 248, 249.
Lees-Smith, H. B., 267.
Livingstone, David, 242, 272.
Lloyd George, D., 38.
Loyalty, 165-166.
Lull, Raymond, 116.
Lupton, Arnold, 133.
- Materialism, 32.
Mazzini, 279.
Maxse, General, 181.
McMunn, Norman, 172-173, 174.
Mencius, 74, 164, 261.
Method of building new world,
135-136, 224, 265.
Micklem, N. :
The Open Light, 49.
The Galilean, 95, 96, 100.
Micklem and Morgan : *Christ and
Cæsar*, 77, 101, 110, 111,
251.
Mikado, 182.
Militarism, Spirit of, 30, 179.
Milton, John, 115.
Missionary Spirit, The 88, 89,
90, 149.
Moral earnestness, 284.
Morley, Lord, on Compromise,
103.
Movement toward a Christian
order of Industry and Com-
merce, 232.
Movement toward a Christian
International, 68, 264, 266.
Myers, F. W. H., *St. Paul*, 23, 88.
- Nation, The*, 24, 65.
National Guilds League, 236.
Nationalism :
Ultra Nationalism, 27.
Western, 28.
National Antagonisms, 29.
National solidarity, 285.
Naylor, James, 65.
Nettleship, Prof., 57.
- New World Order, Creators of,
120, 146,
Possibility of creating, 240,
282.
Niagara, 279-280.
Nightingale, Florence, 242.
- Obedience, 143-144.
Oundle, 175.
Owen, Robert, 203.
- Peabody, Francis, G., 175.
Penitence, 197.
Penn, William, 254-255, 271,
272.
Pennell, Dr., 272.
Pentecost, 201.
People's Movements, 136.
Political Method, The, 103, 119.
The Christian, 130.
Postgate, R. W., *The Bolsheviki
Theory*, 108, 109.
Power, The Supreme, 52.
Love, 120, 288.
Prayer, 151.
Production for use, 223.
Progress by consent, 131.
Public opinion, creation of, 126.
Public Prosecutor, 118.
Punishment, 145, 173.
- Ragaz, Prof., 75.
Rauschenbusch, W. :
Dare we be Christians? 26,
186.
*Christianity and the Social
Crisis*, 200, 201.
Reducing Numbers who will
work bad system, 128.
Relations to the State, 117, 133.
Repentance, 285.
Repatriation, 260.
Research, 209-210.
Richard, Henry, 246.
Richmond, Kenneth, 176.
Robson, G. B. :
The Way to Personality, 49,
55, 71.
Kingship of God, 55, 94.
Rolland, M. Romain, 75.

- Rowntree, B. Seebohm, *The Human Factor in Industry*, 227.
- Royden, A. Maude, *The Great Adventure*, 58, 117.
- Ruskin, John, 162.
- Russell, Bertrand :
The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism, 108, 238.
Principles of Social Reconstruction, 141, 148, 153, 154.
- Schreiner, Olive, 63.
- Self-expression, Unchecked, 40, 41, 173.
- Sermon on the Mount, 71, 72, 117, 156, 280.
- Sex-equality, 140, 155.
- Shareholders' Movement, 231.
- Shanghai Cotton Mill, 229.
- Sharp, Evelyn, 168.
- Sharp, D. L., 169.
- Shaw, S. Adele, *The Survey*, 225.
- Sino-Japanese relations, 210, 211.
- Slavery in America, 127.
 In Pemba, 127.
- Social progress, True way of, 31, 54.
 Slow Progress, 77.
- Social Order, The true, 52.
 Remaking the, 125, 150.
 The new, 193, 205, 286.
- Society of Friends (Quakers), 82, 84, 156, 256, 260, 261.
- Sohm, Rudolph, *Outlines of Church History*, 104.
- South African War, 270.
- Soviet System, 237.
- Sparkes, Malcolm, 257.
- Speakers' Conference, 131.
- Special responsibilities assumed, 129.
- Spiritual revival, 282, 290.
- Srinagar, 175.
- State Idea, The, 181.
- Stimulation by example, 127.
- Strikes settled, 129, 130.
- Student Christian Movement, 84.
- Sympathy, 284.
- Tagore, Rabindranath, *Nationalism*, 29.
- Tawney, R. H., 24, 46.
The Acquisitive Society, 221.
Manchester Guardian, 235.
- Telemachus, 77, 115.
- Temple, William, 77.
- Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, 184.
- Tolerance, 283.
- Tolstoi, Leo, Tolstoyan Theory, 110.
- Treaty of Ghent, 269.
- Treaty of Versailles, 116.
- Tuskegee, 175.
- Unity, 207, 261, 267.
- Upper Nigeria, 183.
- Urwick, Prof., 75, 76, 77, 155.
- Use of Force, 110, 113, 114, 145.
- Violent Revolution, 106.
 Pros and cons, 119-20.
- Vocation, 222.
- Wage system, the, 222.
- Washington Conference, 248.
- Way Forward for the Churches, The*, 81, 124, 290.
- Wealth :
 Ill distribution of, 24.
 Power given by, 26.
- Wells, H. G., 37, 174, 250.
New Worlds for Old, 289.
- Williams, Louise H., 136.
- Wilson, W. E. :
The Christian Ideal, 55, 89, 96.
A Colony of Heaven, 70.
- Woolf, L., *International Government*, 267.
- Woolman, John, 78, 127, 199, 223.
- Worship, 197.
- Y.W.C.A. (America), 208, 233.

The Christian Revolution Series

Edited by Professor NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M.A.

- (1) LAY RELIGION. By HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B. Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. 4s. net.
- (2) RECONCILIATION AND REALITY. By W. FEARON HALLIDAY, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 5s. 6d. net.
- (3) THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR. A Contribution to the History of Christian Ethics. By C. J. CADOUX, M.A., D.D. With Foreword by the Rev. W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.
- (4) THE OPEN LIGHT: An Enquiry into Faith and Reality. By NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.
- (5) THE WAY TO PERSONALITY. By GEORGE B. ROBSON. Third Edition. Cr. 8vo. 5s. 6d. net. Paper Covers, 3s. 6d. net.
- (6) THE CHRISTIAN IDEAL. By W. E. WILSON, B.D. Cr. 8vo. 5s. 6d. net.
- (7) THE CHRIST OF REVOLUTION. By JOHN R. COATES, B.A. Cr. 8vo. 5s. net. Paper Covers, 3s. net.
- (8) THE REMNANT. By RUFUS M. JONES, D.Litt. Cr. 8vo. 5s. 6d. net.
- (9) THE KINGSHIP OF GOD. By GEORGE B. ROBSON. Cr. 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.
- (10) MAN AND HIS BUILDINGS. By T. S. ATLEE, M.A., A.R.I.B.A. Illustrated. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.
- (11) THE MEANING OF PAUL FOR TO-DAY. By Prof. C. H. DODD, M.A. Second Impression. Cr. 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.
- (12) CHRIST AND CÆSAR. By N. MICKLEM, M.A., and H. MORGAN, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.
- (13) CHRISTIAN JUSTICE. By NORMAN L. ROBINSON, M.A. Cr. 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.
- (14) ESSAYS IN CHRISTIAN THINKING. By A. T. CADOUX, B.A., D.D. Cr. 8vo. 6s. 6d. net.
- (15) RELIGION AND BIOLOGY. By ERNEST E. UNWIN, M.Sc. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.
- (16) THE CONSTRUCTIVE REVOLUTION OF JESUS. By Professor SAMUEL DICKEY. Cr. 8vo. 6s. net.
- (17) THE CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION: An Essay on the Method of Social Progress. By HENRY T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

LONDON: THE SWARTHMORE PRESS, LTD.

Religion and the Future

Life EDITED BY E. HERSHEY SNEATH, LL.D.

Demy 8vo.

12s. 6d. net.

Written by eminent Professors who are specialists in the history of religions, this volume traces the evolution of the belief in life after death, and describes the processes of its development from the crude belief of primitive man to the unswerving faith of the Christian believer.

The Doctrine of Sin

BY REGINALD STEWART MOXON, M.A., D.D.

Demy 8vo.

10s. 6d. net.

"A great book ; a searching, truthful, courageous book."—*Expository Times.*

Essays

in Biblical Interpretation

BY HENRY PRESERVED SMITH

Sm. Royal 8vo.

10s. 6d. net.

"Dr. Smith has earned the gratitude of students of the Old Testament by tracing the origin of the historical method of interpretation and the various stages of evolution through which it has passed."—*Church Times.*

Modernism and the Christian Faith

BY PROF. J. A. FAULKNER

Med. 8vo.

12s. 6d. net.

"The amount of reading revealed by the book is really amazing. . . . It is, as a whole, a wonderful piece of work."—*Manchester Guardian.*

LONDON : GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LIMITED
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

The Return of Christendom

BY A GROUP OF CHURCHMEN

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY BISHOP GORE AND AN EPILOGUE BY
Cr. 8vo. G. K. CHESTERTON *7s. 6d. net.*

This book starts from the conviction that the world is above all in need of a unifying principle, for lack of which civilization is rapidly disintegrating. It urges that this must involve the restoration in new forms of the mediæval ideal of Christendom, and it finds implicit in the Catholic Faith the elements of a distinctive Christian sociology.

The Founder of Quakerism

A Psychological Study of the Mysticism of George Fox

Demy 8vo. BY RACHEL KNIGHT, PH.D. *12s. 6d. net.*

A Short History of Quakerism

BY ELIZABETH B. EMMOTT

WITH INTRODUCTION BY DR. RUFUS M. JONES

Demy 8vo. *Illustrated* *Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.*

This book is based upon the Rowntree Series of Quaker History by Dr. Rufus M. Jones and William C. Braithwaite, and is an attempt to bring within smaller compass, for the use of busy people, the store of interesting material and the spiritual message of those wonderful volumes.

No More War

and Other Sermons.

Cr. 8vo. BY REV. W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. *5s. net.*

This present selection of a year's sermons has been made on the following principles: (1) some are included because they demonstrate the still unrealized implications of the Christian Faith; (2) some because they were liked by those who heard them; (3) and some because they were not.

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LIMITED
RUSKIN HOUSE, 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1

The Essentials of Religion

Cr. 8vo. BY REV. J. WILSON HARPER, D.D. 7s. 6d. net.

This is not a doctrinal treatise. Scholars will find ample evidence of research in the book which, however, is specially offered to those who have not time to read elaborate theological works, but are yet anxious to know at least in outline what can be said on behalf of the essentials of religion and their bearings on daily life.

Regeneration & Reconstruction— a Call to the Church

Cr. 8vo. BY REV. S. B. JOHN 3s. 6d. net.

FOREWORD BY REV. JOHN CLIFFORD, D.D.

This work is a plea for the Church to realize its function in the present age by producing new personalities who shall be the centres of new movements having a new world-order as their goal. The argument is comprehensive and sustained by examples drawn from history, literature and philosophy. It is emphatically a book for the hour.

God in the Old Testament

BY R. A. AYTOUN

Cr. 8vo. Cloth, 6s. net; Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

This book describes clearly and concisely the growth of the Jewish people in the knowledge of God. It shows how they came to appreciate, not only the unity of God, but also His justice and His love. The book thus brings out the permanent value of the Old Testament.


The Meaning of the Cross

BY EDWARD GRUBB, M.A.

Cr. 8vo. 5s. net.

"The book, though small, is of exceptional value. . . . No time is wasted on irrelevancies, but nothing of real importance seems to be omitted. . . ."
The Friend.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01000 4689